Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-188
Tuesday
29 September 198-

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-188 *29 September 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

NATO, Warsaw Pact Resume Vienna Talks 1
Yazov Replies to Antiwar Physician's Group 1
U.S. Tests Laser Weapon at White Sands Site 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Pyadyshev Speaks to Reporters 29 Sep 2
Discusses Arms Agreement 2
'Refuseniks' Allowed to Leave *[AFP]* 2
West Berlin IDU Conference Holds Session *[Pshenkin in IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 2
Arms Accord, UNGA, Nicaragua Reviewed *[Kortunov in PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 3
'Top Priority' Program on Missile Accord *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 5
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[Levin, Shishlin, Tsvetov]* 9
Moscow TV Program Discusses Human Rights 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Arrives in Poland, Meets Jaruzelski *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 18
Bush Involvement in Contra Affair Alleged 18
Dubinin Gives Gorbachev Reply to Physician 18
Cuomo Discusses Results of Moscow Visit 18
Canadian Parliamentarians Arrive in Moscow 19

China

Far East Institute Chief on Ties With PRC *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 19

Northeast Asia

Nakasone: INF Agreement 'Step Forward' 23
U.S. Plans SDI Participants Conference 23
MPR's Namsry Hails INF Agreement 23
DPRK Conference Urges Korean Reunification 23

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Foreign Minister Addresses UNGA 24
Afghan Delegate Speaks at Press Conference 24
Najib Addresses Meeting of Hazara Tribes *[IZVESTIYA 22 Sep]* 24
Afghan Commission on Plane Crash Concludes 25
Kornilov Views DRA-Pakistan Situation *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 19 Sep]* 25
U.S. Interference in India Criticized *[Ivanov]* 27
Commentary Views Israel's 'Nuclear Option' 28
Soviet Delegation Completes Algerian Visit *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 28
Meetings, Discussions Mark YAR Celebration 29
Yemeni Envoy's Address *[IZVESTIYA 25 Sep]* 29
Lizichev Leaves for YAR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Sep]* 29
Tatliyev Heads Visit 29
Discussions With 'Arafat 29
Delegation Departs 30

East Europe

Romanian Parliamentarians Visit Moscow 30
Arrive 27 Sep 30
Meet Gromyko 28 Sep 30
LCY CC Plenary Meeting Held in Belgrade 31
SFRY Airlines Head Meets Silayev 31
Briefs 31
Agreement with Bulgaria 31

West Europe

Gorbachev Meets French Delegation 29 Sep 31
AFP Report 32
Preview of Meeting *[AFP]* 32
French Arms Stance 'Rebuke' of Moscow *[Bolshakov in PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 32
Seminar Urges EEC Defense Cooperation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* 33
Petrovskiy Meets Cypriot Foreign Minister 34
Moscow Interviews Finnish Premier on Ties 34
UK Units 'No Novices' in Invasion Training *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* 34
Gorbachev Book Published in Austria 35
Soviet Magazine Publishes in Greek *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* 35

Latin America & Caribbean

Further on Shevardnadze's Visit to Brazil 35
Press Statement on Arrival 35
Meets President, Foreign Minister 36
Brazilian Reportage *[cross-reference]* 36
Ortega Urges Activation of Guatemala Accord 37
El Salvador Rebel Groups Ready for Talks 37

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Pyadyshev Briefs Press on Gorbachev 38
Back From 'Holidays' 38
Family 'Just Fine' *[AFP]* 38
Kremlin 'Power Struggle' Suspected *[Hamburg BILD 29 Sep]* 38
Yakovlev: Conservatives Hindering Reform *[AFP]* 38
Ligachev, Dolgikh on Fuel Use Shortcomings 39
Sakharov Provides List of Prisoners *[AFP]* 40
Released Political Prisoners Meet Official *[AFP]* 40
RSFSR Supreme Soviet Retires Grishin 40
Pitovranov Interviewed on Restructuring *[Belgrade BORBA 4 Sep]* 41
Gasoline Lines Reported in Kiev *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 25 Sep]* 43

Economic

Deputy Finances Minister Interviewed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 25 Sep]* 44
Self-Financing in Chemical Industry Viewed 47

Agricultural

Kazakhstan Seeks Help To 'Save Harvest' *[AFP]* 50
Harvesting, Plowing Progress Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 24 Sep]* 50
Central Committee Resolution on Private Plots *[PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 51
Media Report 25-26 Sep Developments 54

Military

Navy Main Staff's Navoytsev Interviewed 55

NATO, Warsaw Pact Resume Vienna Talks

LD281619 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Vienna September 28 TASS—Consultations between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO on the start of new talks on conventional arms and armed forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals were resumed after a recess here today.

Many participants noted in their statements that the prospect for a considerable improvement of the situation in Europe as a result of the Soviet-American agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles should be backed by practical steps in the field of cutting conventional arms and strengthening overall stability in Europe.

The head of the Soviet delegation, Ambassador Yuriy Kashlev, drew attention of the participants in the consultations to military-political issues raised in Mikhail Gorbachev's article "The Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World," provisions of the "defensive strategy" and "military sufficiency," and the need to agree already now on mechanisms of maintaining peace at sharply reduced levels of non-nuclear arms.

Representatives of the socialist countries proposed intensifying work on the mandate of the future negotiations, starting with the vote on its elements on which there was already certain proximity of positions.

The mandate should be agreed upon before the completion of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and be included in its final document.

Yazov Replies to Antiwar Physician's Group

LD282028 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Bonn September 28 TASS—A reply from the USSR Minister of Defence Dmitriy Yazov to letters from Christine Toma, a representative of the West German section of the organisation International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, was presented at the Soviet Embassy in the FRG today.

In her letters Christine Toma expressed the profound concern of physicians and the entire FRG public over the continued testing of nuclear weapons and stockpiling of these instruments of mass annihilation. The letters contain a call for the ending of nuclear tests.

The ending of nuclear weapon tests, says the USSR defense minister's reply, is one of the most pressing problems of our time. In my country the attitude to this problem is unequivocal, the minister stressed—to stop nuclear tests, achieve a substantial reduction of nuclear arms and then their elimination. Such is the Soviet Government's political will.

We have proved this also by our moratorium on nuclear explosions, Dmitriy Yazov wrote further. It lasted for 18 months and was repeatedly extended, this giving the United States a chance to follow our good example. This, however, did not happen and despite protests by the world public the American side started a new series of nuclear tests on February 3, 1987. In this situation the Soviet Union could no longer continue its unilateral restraint to the detriment of its own security and that of its allies.

Nevertheless, Dmitriy Yazov stressed in conclusion, we are prepared to put an end to nuclear tests at any day or hour, should the United States take such a step as well. So now it is entirely up to the United States.

Christine Toma thanked for the reply from the USSR minister of defence. "In our opinion the ending of nuclear tests would be an important step towards ridding the whole world of nuclear weapons. We are for greater friendship among peoples", she stated.

The secretary of the West German section of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Ulrich Fit, who was present when the reply was handed over, said in an interview to TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov that West German medics were now mounting an extensive action in support of the demand to stop nuclear tests. More than 1,300 West German physicians have sent letters to the United States, the USSR, Britain and France calling for a solution of this problem. But a response came only from Moscow, Ulrich Fit went on. The Western powers have not shown any understanding of our appeals, he stressed.

U.S. Tests Laser Weapon at White Sands Site

LD251526 Moscow TASS in English 1007 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] New York September 25 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kirilchenko:

The United States has tested a laser weapon at the White Sands test site, New Mexico, *The Associated Press* reported today.

During the test, a flying target was shot down with the use of a powerful laser device.

According to a Pentagon spokesman, the military experiment was conducted with a view to perfecting the U.S. non-nuclear potential. He refused to provide more details about the test.

The White Sands site is known for laser tests that are conducted there within the framework of the "Star Wars" programme envisaging the deployment of arms, including nuclear weapons, in outer space.

Pyadyshev Speaks to Reporters 29 Sep

Discusses Arms Agreement

LD291457 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—Speaking of the work which began in Geneva to prepare a Soviet-U.S. agreement on global elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles (MRM and SRM), Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated at a briefing today that the Soviet And American delegations were assigned a task to complete the work by October 22, the day when U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz would begin his visit to Moscow.

"The rhythm of the recent days in Geneva gives grounds to believe that the delegations will succeed in doing the job within the said time-limit", he said.

"As of today, four main articles of a future treaty have been coordinated", the ministry's spokesman said. "The treaty will consist of a total of 16 articles. In particular, an article on a stage-by-stage elimination of the missiles has been agreed upon. Work is being carried out on a broad scale".

"Special attention is being given to verification issues. They are under discussion in a special group, and will be formulated in a protocol to the treaty. There are lots of difficulties. But those, in the main, are of technical nature. Soviet and American experts are to meet to discuss how it would be possible to do away most effectively with the missiles which are subject to elimination under a future treaty", Boris Pyadyshev said.

'Refuseniks' Allowed to Leave

AU250745 Paris AFP in English 0124 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 25 (AFP)—Svetlana Braun, 24, a refusenik who has been trying for three years to join her husband in the United States, and relatives of "reformed" dissident Piotr Yakir, who died in 1983, have been told they can leave the Soviet Union, an official source said Thursday.

The Supreme Soviet Commission—formed early this year to re-examine applications rejected by the Visa Office—"met recently and decided in favor of most of the cases submitted, including those of Svetlana Braun and the Yakir family", foreign ministry spokesman Boris Pyadyshev said.

Mrs. Braun and Evgeni Yakir, who had not yet received official notification of the decision, said they had been hopeful in recent weeks because of interventions on their behalf by the United States and France.

Mrs. Braun was turned down for a visa five times in three years, officially because she came into the category of "state secret holder". She was a chemistry student before marrying a U.S. lawyer, Keith Braun, who is a spokesman for divided Soviet-American families.

The issue of divided families—of which a dozen or so cases are said to be outstanding—was reportedly discussed last week during a visit by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to Washington.

The family of Piotr Yakir comprises his cousin Evgeny Yakir, together with the latter's mother, wife and son. The son, Aleksandr, spent two years in a labour camp from 1984 to 1986 for refusing to do his military service. r The family had been seeking to leave the Soviet Union since 1973. Piotr Yakir, son of a general shot by Soviet dictator Josef Stalin, had already at that time spent 17 years in camps.

Mr. Evgeny Piotr said he intended to settle in Israel.

West Berlin IDU Conference Holds Session

PM281255 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Pshenkin report under the "Pertinent Notes" rubric: "Words Have Deviated from Deeds"]

[Text] West Berlin—The third conference of the "International Democratic Union" [IDU] has ended here.

This organization, created in 1983, now unites 27 conservative parties from 25 countries. The strictest security measures were introduced in the city.

The range of questions on the conference's agenda was broad: from relations between East and West and disarmament to the world economic situation, the situation in Latin America, and terrorism. A bulky schedule, there's no denying...

H. Kohl welcomed the Soviet-U.S. accord in principle on eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, assessing it as a historic step. He along with M. Thatcher and J. Chirac, who took part in the conference, spoke in their speeches of the need to continue efforts in the direction of disarmament. In a gesture to the spirit of the times, with regard to the tendencies outlined in international politics in recent months, the statement adopted by the conference's participants unanimously expresses themselves in favor of a total ban on chemical and biological weapons throughout the world and the reduction of troops and conventional armaments in Europe.

They also voted for further efforts to be made to reduce stocks of shorter-range nuclear missile weapons and the achievement of political binding confidence-building and security measures in Europe. But no specific measures were proposed and there was no indication of where, when, and how to effect the reductions and to apply efforts.

But even these statements, albeit made for effect, when they issue from the lips of the leaders of the most conservative parties deserve attention, and show at the same time that it has become impossible to bypass or ignore the opinion and mood of the world public.

The association of conservatives in the form of the IDU would not have been what it is if it had not accompanied the summary of its statement and its communique with a mass of reservations and preliminary conditions, and if the cliches and stereotypes of the old thinking had not prevailed at the conference. M. Thatcher continued to claim that the doctrine of nuclear deterrence which, let us note, has brought our civilization to the brink of catastrophe, is, according to her, the most reliable guarantee of security. With the approval of the heads of government of the FRG and France and other participants in the conference, she warned against "overhasty" talks on shorter-range nuclear weapons, and against allowing the Soviet Union to form the impression that it could "haggle" for these weapons with the West. At future talks, the leaders of the leading West European countries insisted at the conference, everything must proceed in accordance with the West's ideas and priorities. But what then will become of mutual consideration and balance of interests and equal security for all countries?

Openly refusing to acknowledge the postwar realities which have formed in Europe, the leaders of the conservative parties included among "key" issues the question of the division of Europe and of Germany, and of the defensive installations on the GDR'S state border with West Berlin (in the vocabulary of the Western leaders it is called a "wall"). The laying of wreaths at the installations looked blasphemous and provocative. But the fact that it was FRG Chancellor H. Kohl who invited participants, guests, and journalists to the conference in West Berlin, which is not part of the FRG, was not simply blasphemy but openly provocative and illegal. It is the grossest violation of the four-power agreement on West Berlin.

Against this background it is difficult to reconcile with practical deeds the good intentions and declarations on confidence-building measures and measures to prevent conflicts and free the peoples from fear of a thermonuclear conflict.

Arms Accord, UNGA, Nicaragua Reviewed

PM281550 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "International Review"]

[Text] Going Further [subhead]

It is 10 days since the exciting news sped around the world: For the first time in the age of nuclear confrontation between the USSR and the United States, an accord in principle has been reached on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles. Their elimination, not limitation. This news generated an avalanche of reactions which are still coming in to this day.

A sigh of relief, an upsurge of hope—that is how one can briefly characterize the initial emotional reaction to the accord in Washington. Millions of people sensed that the prospect of a world without nuclear weapons has come a step closer.

Now the statesmen, political commentators, and press organs have begun to analyze the new situation that is emerging in the international arena. First and foremost many are asking: How is the change in the present Washington administration's policy to be explained? And does it herald a radical change? It is hard to give a simple answer to this question.

I think it is first and foremost a question of the profound changes which have taken place in the world recently, especially in the last 2 years. It has become increasingly clear that the "position of strength" policy has reached an impasse. There is a growing understanding that mankind cannot use the old criteria to cope with the terrible dangers that have arisen on the threshold of the third millenium. Life itself prompts the conclusion that a fundamentally different approach is needed.

The Soviet Union was the first to realize this. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement of 15 January 1986, the course proclaimed by the 27th CPSU Congress, and the entire range of large-scale peace initiatives put forward by the USSR and the other socialist countries aroused such a broad international response precisely because in these documents the peoples found the answer to the question of how to emerge from the labyrinth of problems of the nuclear age.

Another point must also be noted at once: The Soviet program for preventing nuclear war has received powerful support from the socialist countries, has won the solidarity of dozens of states in the nonsocialist world, including the Nonaligned Movement, and has been welcomed not only by communist and workers parties, but also by many other political parties and public movements. It is also important that the socialist countries' proposals have met with a positive response in the bourgeois circles in the United States and Western Europe which adhere to a realistic position.

It has become increasingly obvious that the renunciation of nuclear arrogance, the readiness to reckon with the legitimate interests of partners, the desire to draw up new rules for living together, and respect for international agreements and institutions are the elementary norms dictated by our times. The result of the Soviet-American meetings in Washington shows that when both sides are guided by this approach, success is achieved. The position of those circles in NATO countries that claim the problems of reducing the arms race are insoluble has been shown to be untenable. It is being confirmed in practice that the potential for solving these problems is considerably wider than the skeptics thought.

The accords in the American capital establish a real basis for opening the door to a new period of relaxation of international tension. However, it would be a mistake to suppose that events will take this course automatically. The accord on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles is only a first step, only a beginning, after which the continuation must be achieved at all costs. And that will not by any means be an easy process.

The report of the Soviet-American accords by no means prompted rejoicing in the camp of the advocates of nuclear weapons. And they are already sounding the assembly, declaring a "general mobilization" of their supporters.

The black hordes in the United States were the first to go onto the offensive, infuriated that the Preisdent had "dared" to come to an agreement with Moscow. They are trying to play on the President's favorite child—the SDI program. Pressure is being stepped up on the White House with the aim of wrecking the 1972 ABM Treaty so as to give them a free hand for the implementation of the "star wars" program. It can hardly be considered a coincidence that at precisely this time two steps were taken simultaneously in Washington: A decision on the appropriation of more funds for the implementation of the SDI program was pushed through the Senate, and the Pentagon chief signed a long list of practical measures for the accelerated implementation of this program.

The reaction to the Soviet-American accords was not unambiguous in Western Europe, either. The vast majority of West European statesmen and politicians are unanimous in their assessment: An important step has been taken along the path to mankind's delivery from the burden of nuclear weapons. Characteristic results were obtained from a public opinion poll in the four major West European countries, carried out the other day by the Netherlands company Burke-interview: 60 percent of those polled stated that the conclusion of an agreement on the elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles accords above all with Europe's interests.

But that is by no means what everyone thinks. Those circles in open or veiled opposition to nuclear disarmament are tyring to speculate in every way on the peoples' desire for security, seeking to represent nuclear weapons as a "means of preventing war." They strive to instil in West Europeans the idea that their countries would find themselves "without a nuclear umbrella," although, as is well known, even after the resolution of the question of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles there will still be thousands of American nuclear weapons of other classes in Western Europe. Characteristically, these passions are being intensively kindled in France and Britain. The provocative purport of this campaign is obvious in the light of the fact that these countries have their own nuclear weapons.

The favorite thesis currently circulating is the claim that after the Soviet-American agreement comes into force the "superiority" of the Warsaw Pact countries in conventional arms will pose a special threat to Western Europe. There is, however, a legitimate question: If the NATO countries are worried about this, then why have they been shelving for 6 months the concrete proposal from the Warsaw Pact countries on reducing armed forces and conventional arms over the entire area from the Atlantic to the Urals?

Britain's *The Observer*, in an editorial published the other day, wrote quite reasonably: "For Europe, it is far better to admit that it is time to reduce the heat of military confrontation, and that the accord concluded in Washington offers a chance of this. It would be simply stupid to hesitate now that determination has given us so much."

Demand of the Times [subhead]

It is noteworthy that the 42d UN General Assembly session began under the sign of practically unanimous approval by its participants of the change which has taken shape in international relations. The United Nations is gaining new opportunities to implement its historic mission in the cause of maintaining and strengthening universal peace.

Many speakers at the session have spoken of how a highly beneficial influence will be exerted on the development of this process by M.S. Gorbachev's article "Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World." The Soviet leader's article, permeated by profound respect for the lofty principles of the United Nations and for its charter, contains a detailed package of concrete proposals whose implementation will make it possible to decisively increase the prestige and effectiveness of this organization, as well as of other international institutions and mechanisms. It only remains to express regret that the U.S. President's speech at the General Assembly session did not contain a constructive response to the Soviet program for building a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, which is supported by such a vast section of mankind.

The Soviet Union's constructive steps to enhance the role of the United Nations are an integral part of the efforts to put into practice the program put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress for building a comprehensive system of international security. Of course, the building of such a system is a long-term, complex, and painstaking matter. It requires tremendous labor and collective efforts by all who really seek trust and mutual understanding between peoples.

Nonetheless the principles of the new political thinking are increasingly penetrating world public awareness. The system of international security proposed by the Soviet Union is only just being set up, but is already working.

Considerable attention was attracted everywhere by the concrete proposals on the relaxation of military tension in the planet's "hot spots," in particular in the Persian Gulf region, submitted by the Soviet Union in E.A. Shevardnadze's speech at the UN General Assembly session.

The principles of civilized intercourse are being introduced more and more firmly into the practice of international life. New norms for relationships between states are developing in the economic sphere. The most recent evidence of this is the creation of joint enterprises by

socialist and capitalist countries. New legislation and administrative rules are being adopted to resolve in a humane spirit questions of the reuniting of families, contacts between people and organizations, the visa system, and so forth. Attempts by certain circles in the United States and certain other NATO states to erect a kind of "wall" in contacts between the socialist and Western countries have collapsed: Trips by delegations and the exchange of cultural assets have taken on a greater scope, the scale of tourism has become enormous, and so forth.

The point contained in the agreement signed by 35 states in Stockholm on greater openness in the military sphere is being fleshed out. It is becoming usual for observers to be present at military maneuvers of the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. A group of American congressmen was able to inspect without hindrance the construction of a radar station in the Krasnoyarsk region. The Soviet Union has announced that it will invite the participants in talks on chemical weapons to the Soviet military facility at Shikhany to study specimens of our chemical ammunition and techniques for the destruction of chemical weapons. Foreign experts will also be invited to the unusual plant being built in Kuybyshev Oblast, in the region of Chapayevsk City. This is a facility for the destruction of chemical weapons. And it is symbolic that this project has been entrusted to the chemical servicemen of the Soviet Army, who are thus turning their knowledge and experience not to the production of the means of destroying people, but to the cause of disarmament.

Yes, the vision of the world that is opening up from the heights of the new political thinking is one that accords with mankind's most cherished aspirations.

Following a Course of Reconciliation [subhead]

The Nicaraguan Government has announced the new steps it is taking within the framework of the practical implementation of the plan for a peaceful solution to the Central American crisis elaborated by the presidents of five countries in Guatemala.

The Sandinist government called on all the country's political forces to take part in the national dialogue which begins 5 October. Nicaragua was the first of the Central American countries to set up a commission for national reconciliation. It is headed by Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo. National reconciliation commissions have also been set up in the country's administrative districts and departments. Seeking to facilitate the commissions' work, the government has adopted a decision unilaterally to cease offensive operations by the Sandinist People's Army against the contras in certain regions. Naturally, army units will respond to fire if they are subjected to an attack, especially since the contras rejected the partial cease-fire announced by the government. An amnesty law is being implemented. The decree on pardoning citizens of Central American states who have served sentences for counterrevolutionary activities is being put into practice.

The strengthening of the people's power enabled it to carry out a number of measures aimed at expanding democratic processes in the country, and in particular to lift restrictions on the activity of the mass media imposed under the state of emergency that is in force in the country. These measures include allowing Radio Catolica to resume its activity and permitting the opposition newspaper *La Prensa* to publish without restrictions.

All this is irrefutable evidence of the Sandinist government's good will. At the same time it is proof of its respect for the documents that the Central American states themselves elaborated by joint efforts and for the contribution made to the cause of a political settlement by the countries of the Contadora group and support group.

Managua's good will is graphic evidence that despite opposition from the forces of imperialist aggression, the course of ending fratricidal wars through national reconciliation is forging a path for itself in international relations. This course is upheld by revolutionary governments. It is based on concern for peace and for the people's well-being. The advocates of this course proceed on the basis that armed regional conflicts, as is clearly visible from the example of the Persian Gulf situation, pose a serious danger to the cause of universal peace. It is greatly preferable to resolve complex contradictions between different political forces and groups not by force of arms, but by means of political dialogue, on the basis of national consensus.

Just such a path, which carries the true solution to national problems, has been chosen by the governments of Nicaragua, Afghanistan, and Cambodia. Of course, this path is not strewn with roses. The success of such a course thwarts the plans of those forces in the imperialist camp that are not only trying to use mercenaries to extinguish the seats of revolution, but also pin their far-reaching aggressive objectives on the unleashing and fanning of regional armed conflicts. That is why American dollars flow in a lavish stream into the coffers of the dushmans, contras, and other mercenaries, while the hirelings' arsenals are constantly replenished with lethal foreign weapons which are used to kill the peaceful population.

But these efforts are futile. Revolutionary forces are tempered in the heat of the struggle, their mass base is widening, and the people's support for their just cause is growing. And their course of national reconciliation, which is a contribution to the cause of preserving peace, meets with growing understanding and support from peace-loving, progressive mankind.

'Top Priority' Program on Missile Accord

LD270130 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 Sep 87

["Top Priority" program presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. Addressing the 42nd session of the UN General Assembly, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said that for the first time in history the idea of nuclear disarmament is close to the beginning of fulfillment. He went on to say that the idea is not new; what's new about it is that it turns out to be possible. He also said that the Soviet-American agreement in principle on scrapping all Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range weapons is the lesser part of what has happened. Something more important, he added, has taken place, and that is the Soviet Union and the United States for the first time have spoken together the first word in a nuclear-free vocabulary. Now, we have spoken the first word and I'd like you to tell me what do you think about the second word? What kind of a second word has to follow, or, perhaps, what kind of a second word you'd like to hear.

Well, Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, if you mean free nuclear world, you mean that or you mean something else?

[Kuznetsov] I mean we have spoken the first word in a nuclear-free vocabulary. Now we have got to go on from that.

[Bogdanov] Yes, I, but I have a feeling that we should speak today not only about free nuclear world but about the mechanism which may guarantee, which may bring us nearer to that free nuclear world. Now, now it implies that we have in mind, of course, strategic offensive weapons within the framework of strengthening the regime of ABM 1972 treaty. And what we mean by that? Fifty percent cut in strategic triad. It is an immense, it is immense—if we could achieve that it would be a real immense step forward in—toward a non-nuclear world. Is it possible, or maybe it's again wishful thinking.

[Kuznetsov] Yes.

[Bogdanov] Because after all we are about to achieve a most, the easiest part of the equation, if you like, INF.

[Kuznetsov] In short, that is why it was called the first word in that...

[Bogdanov interrupting] Pavel, is it, is it not another dream? Do we have a mechanism to deal with all that? Do we?

[Kuznetsov] Even when it is nuclear disarmament?

[Bogdanov] Yes, with nuclear disarmament.

[Kuznetsov] Well you have a group of experts discussing this kind of problems in...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] You have a group of experts.

[Kuznetsov] ...various fields yet at Geneva.

[Bogdanov] Yes, you have people discussing at Geneva, but let me remind you, Pavel, that the nuclear disarmament idea first started where? At the UN. In 1946 we first suggested the first disarmament, nuclear disarmament, atomic disarmament plan not at Geneva, not in Reykjavik, no [laughs] not somewhere else but within the framework of the UN. Now you have over 10,000 nuclear strategic warheads which is quite enough to destroy the whole humanity, the whole civilization. It is not Soviet-American problem, it is universal, it is human problem. Do you have another universal organization but the UN on this earth, that is the logical (?side) of my thinking. Maybe I am wrong, Sergey.

[Kuznetsov] Are you suggesting that small nations, well, third world nations with no nuclear weapons and with very primitive conventional forces should have an equal say in deciding on nuclear (?problems)

[Bogdanov] That is my strong belief that today everybody has the right to speak about nuclear danger, not only the right to speak but he, he has a duty to make a contribution to the solution of that problem. It is all human problem.

[Kuznetsov] Okay. The more we advance in the nuclear field, and I hope there will be some advancements, the more often the problem of conventional weapons and the imbalances will crop up. We have already seen this problem being very prominent during the first every live spacebridge linking Moscow and the United States in Washington where panels representing Soviet and American lawmakers had a back and forth discussion, a very frank discussion on a number of political issues including arms control. And also, speaking in Oslo, Norway, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington said that the Soviet-American agreement in principle on scrapping all those nuclear missiles did, not signal the dawn of a nuclear-free age and that denuclearization is not around the corner, and that NATO should have, should preserve the mixture of both nuclear and conventional arms to maintain its policy of flexible response. How serious are all these people who raise the problem of conventional weapons, how sincere they are?

[Plekhanov] Well, I would question their sincerity very much I, you mentioned the bridge. I was shocked by a statement by Congressman Aspin, who should know better and who does know better than asserting that the NATO is outnumbered in conventional forces.

[Kuznetsov] [passage indistinct]

[Plekhanov] One to two. No, no, no, no, no, he said, he said about convention...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] [passage indistinct]

[Plekhanov]...conventional forces. He said there is a two to one superiority on the Warsaw Pact side. As far as the numbers of troops are concerned, NATO has more than the Warsaw Pact. There are, there are imbalances and

asymmetries, as we call them. As far as various types of conventional armaments are concerned, there are some asymmetries, there are things which the Warsaw Pact has more and there are other things that the NATO has more and...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting]... but numerically there is ...

[Plekhanov, interrupting]... numerically there is a rough balance and in fact there is a slight edge on the NATO side as far as the troops on the central front, in central Europe, are concerned. Again there is a rough balance. They are haggling over figures at Vienna but those figures do not change the fact that—I mean there is nothing like the huge superiority that Congressman Aspin was painting. And to me this is an illustration of how sincere the other side is, and I question their sincerity. What is undoubtful, as far as I am concerned, is that they want to keep...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Sergey, I am sorry interrupting you. Don't you think that Congressman has been—might be supplied with the wrong data?

[Plekhanov] Well, I'm sure that [laughs] I'm sure that he does know, he should know. I mean, he's a professor in political science. He has published so much.

[Bogdanov] And he is the chairman of the Armed Services Commission.

[Plekhanov] Yes [words indistinct] that's right.

[Bogdanov] Which is a very important body.

[Kuznetsov] Right.

[Plekhanov] Though he has his own games to play and his own axes to grind, to grind, I understand. But you also mentioned Lord Carrington and he says that the nuclear—don't rejoice, a nuclear-free world is not around the corner. [sentence as heard] I think that reflects a very obsolete, an obstinate position on the part of NATO, which is to keep a strong military fist, a strong conventional capacity as well as a nuclear capacity in order to be able to use force in conflicts which may be happening outside of Europe. They are worried that the West cannot do without the military force in foreign policy. What we are suggesting now is a radical break with centuries of human history. We are suggesting that international relations should be freed of the excessive burden of military power which they have carried through the ages. So we are suggesting a radical break with history and the West is apparently dragging its feet.

[Kuznetsov] Well, I would like to soften your remarks a little bit on those people. I think that it is such a painful process to break away from those centuries of tradition in their, in political thinking that perhaps some people are not prepared to.

[Bogdanov] You know, my, my difficulty is that—it is psychological difficulty. I quite agree with you. There is a very strange situation now. Whatever you hear from the other side, just because it is from the other side it is not acceptable. It might be very reasonable but the other side (?talks). Be careful, beware of the other side. It is not acceptable. I believe that.

[Kuznetsov] You have the old formula: What is good for the Soviet and Russia is bad for the West.

[Bogdanov and Plekhanov] Yes, yes.

[Plekhanov] And if the other side praises what you are doing than that means that you are doing something wrong.

[Bogdanov] Yes, how you can break with centuries of tradition. So all of us, and including ourselves, we face the same very difficult problems. But we should overcome that. Otherwise we are doomed to failure.

[Plekhanov] That is right. We're doomed to...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Um, Go back at the speech by Foreign Minister Shevardnadze at the UN. Commenting on his address, foreign, Western analysts suggested that there were new elements in his approach to world problems as compared to similar Soviet speeches made in the past. If you agree with such a view, what are those new elements and new approaches?

[Plekhanov] Well, there were quite a few. The major one had to do with the role of the UN in the Soviet approach to foreign policy. It was a major pitch for the increase of the role of the UN in the questions of international security. And I think that is a very timely pitch because the role of the UN, its authority in world affairs, has been undermined in the past few years, largely by the approach of the Reagan administration which does not believe in using a forum like that for the solution of major security problems. The Reagan administration has been somewhat unilateralist, as they say in Western Europe, in its approach to security problems.

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Sergey, I am sorry again interrupting you. I would not like to defend the Reagan administration but I would like to be fair to them, hoping that they will be fair to us. How you can expect...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Scratch my back and I will scratch yours.

[Bogdanov] [Laughs] Yes, Yes, Yes. How you can expect them to be little bit, you know, uneasy about the UN if there is a new situation within the UN. You have 150 or something like...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Fifty nine, 159 member-states.

[Bogdanov] Yes, states, and UN are not satisfying American desires any more.

[Plekhanov] Oh, yes, there has been a, there has been a gap.

[Bogadanov] So you have a very independent community. Maybe that is the reason that this administration could not [word indistinct] that.

[Kuznetsov] right.

[Bogdanov] And let's understand that. They have got so used to...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Gentlemen, we are discussing the Soviet position, the Soviet approach to the UN and this new interest perhaps in the UN. Would we like to see this world forum to assume a greater role as an international peacekeeping force, to intervene and perhaps even avert, prevent regional conflicts?

[Plekhanov] Oh, absolutely. I think if we are serious, if we are serious about the peacemaking—beefing up the peacemaking role of the UN—then we have to talk about the muscles that the UN in order to prevent or settle disputes, to keep the terms of ceasefires and so on. And in that connection Eduard Shevardnadze spoke about the possibility of constructing something like such a peace force, something like such a presence in the Persian Gulf, which would be a very reasonable alternative to the current situation when there is a wild buildup of NATO forces in the Persian Gulf and there seems to be more ships there than there is water, or oil, and that could lead to a very, very serious crisis.

[Kuznetsov] It has already led.

[Plekhanov] It has already led, and I mean...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting]... In the light of that attack by an American ship against an Iranian vessel which was laying mines in international waters.

[Plekhanov] Yes, there is a definite escalation of...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] [words indistinct]

[Plekhanov] Yes, yes, and there are more and more ships there and there is no good blueprint for settling the problem, I mean by using those ships. And that worries a lot of people around the world, that you send a lot of hardware...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Prof. Bogdanov, in this connection are the first reactions to the speech by Eduard Shevardnadze at the UN is that the Soviet Union would like to use the UN peacekeeping machinery to promote its own interests.

[Bogdanov] That is exactly what i have already told you.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, Yes, that's the reason...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Whatever...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] That's the reason I (?asked).

[Bogdanov] As it proceedes from the other side it is already bad because that is the other side's idea.

[Kuznetsov] Can you just prove this using as an example this situation in the Persian Gulf?

[Bogdanov] What is, what is, look, what is the Soviet interest? The Persian Gulf is very near by Soviet southern border. What is happening at the Gulf is very closely linked to our security problems. We are interested in assuring that there is no threat for our security from that region. More hostile (?methods) and hostile ships you have more threat for...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] To us.

[Bogdanov] To us. How to solve this problem, if you are realist?

[Kuznetsov] Either to have a UN naval force...

[Bogdanov, interrupting]... naval force or just to send your fleet [laughs] which we are not likely to do.

[Kuznetsov] And [words indistinct] also make Iraq and Iran agree on a ceasefire.

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes, oh, yes.

[Kuznetsov] There was a resolution to that effect.

[Bogdanov] Yes, Yes. And let me come back a little bit to your question, what is the new—what is new in the Shevardnadze speech. Besides what Sergey said, I would like to add that, you know, you have a spirit of cooperation, very deep cooperation. The main idea is that we have no monopoly over the truth. We invite everybody with their truth and we are ready to make out of many truths one universal truth. Isn't it a very new, very new approach?

[Kuznetsov] A very bold...

[Bogdanov, interrupting]... A very bold, very bold approach. That I would like to emphasize. I believe it is very important point of his speech.

[Kuznetsov] As time is running out on us, I would like to ask a final question which has to do with the address to the same body by President Reagan, who in part said that communist governments must change their paths, must embrace freedoms and democratic reforms before there can be peace in Central America and throughout the world. And he also urged Moscow to redefine glasnost as political and intellectual freedom in all its dimensions.

[Plekhanov] Do you know, I read President Reagan's speech and I found it somewhat milder than his previous speeches as far as description of the Soviet Union is concerned and the language was milder. But I was kind of troubled by the same theme...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] There was and, excuse me, and there was a lot of praise for the Soviet-American breakthrough.

[Plekhanov] Oh yes, oh, yes, yes, and a recognition that the coming agreement is very important and this is a breakthrough and so on, which is good of Reagan to speak about that. But as far as teaching the Soviet Union or demanding from the Soviet Union or Nicaragua or any other country—he also mentioned Nicaragua—and saying well, you do that or you do this and then we will talk with you on reasonable terms and only then we can have peace and security. I mean, we could advance a whole list of demands to the United States and pose the question in the same old way, so I sense that President Reagan is changing the language, but the substance on his basic approach over the Soviet Union and any other countries which might have different ideas about foreign policy is staying largely the same. Maybe it is too much to demand of somebody who is, well, a senior citizen, to change his, some of his basic beliefs.

[Bogdanov] Yes, exactly, exactly, Sergey, exactly. We deal with a really very senior citizen, and let him talk whatever he likes. Let him practice his rhetoric. I would not be so critical as you are, Sergey, about this senior gentleman.

[Plekhanov] Well, right, right. In fact, I think I softened my criticism with an admission that, that he sounded milder than...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Yes, it's okay. Thank you, gentlemen, for coming to our studio, and our time is up. I am Pavel Kuznetsov inviting all our listeners to join us again in Top Priority a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelength. Goodbye.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'

LD202004 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 20 Sep 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, publicist; and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, Central Television and All-Union Radio political observer]

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello comrades. The past week has been rich in very important and great international events—both the opening of the 42nd UN General Assembly session and the talks between Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, and Shultz, U.S. Secretary of State. However, our greatest attention was, of course, attracted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's article, which you have all no doubt read. I would like to say the following in connection with the appearance of that article. You know, of course, that the word restructuring has entered almost every language in the world—something indicative of the attention and interest being displayed towards Soviet politics. Up until now, however, this attention and interest have consisted of an emotional rather than a conscious perception of what we are doing in the world arena. But now the world public, the whole world, has become acquainted with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's article. This article attunes the world, world public opinion, towards comprehending just what we put into the concept of restructuring international relations, and what we put into the concept of new political thinking.

[Shishlin] Vladimir Yakovlevich, I agree with your view in principle, but there's one thing I would like to caution against. Unfortunately, the ideas being set out by the Soviet leadership, and in this case, the thoughts and ideas expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in this very principled, important, and significant article, do not become the property of the world public that quickly. As far as the West's mass media are concerned, with all their outward attention towards the Soviet leader's speeches, they are hushing up the Soviet Union's concrete position and approaches revealed in this publication.

[Tsvetov] You know, on this point, I disagree with you. Just as I was on my way to the studio, I looked through the reports from the world telegraph agencies, every one of which reports Mikhail Sergeyevich's article, either in detail or else with commentaries.

[Shishlin] Everyone is talking about the article's significance and importance, but not very much, of course, is being said about its nature or the essence of those thoughts. The article is remarkable in the highest degree, first and foremost because it provides a very complete and concentrated exposition of all the Soviet Union's new approaches, both past and present, as well as those being drawn up for the future. Whether concerning problems connected with ending the arms race, overcoming regional conflicts, establishing human rights, or guaranteeing international economic security, whatever aspect of the article we look at we see new approaches and new elements. Another very interesting thing is the quarters the article is addressed to: It is a genuine example of the very kind of open diplomacy the world needs. The thoughts in the article and its ideas are addressed not only to Western statesmen or statesmen of the East, North, or South, but to world public opinion.

[Tsvetov] Mikhail Sergeyevich uses a very interesting phrase here—the word "jointly" is very important for today's world. That is, he proposes a joint search for a solution to today's major problem—the creation of a comprehensive international security system.

[Levin] In my view another very important point is that the article not only emphasizes the role of the United Nations, but notes the need to enhance that role and the organization's effectiveness. The United Nations was set up by the international community, and is indeed a unique instrument that clearly still has not unfolded its full potential. I think that this point also draws one's attention by virtue of the fact that a great deal is now being said about the UN'S role and place in world affairs. Not only in the Soviet Union, but in the United States and other countries as well.

[Shishlin] But in the United States they talk about it, more often than not, in a negative vein.

[Levin] But that's just the point. What we have here is a very acute clash of views, stances, and even actions between the Soviet Union and the United States. Literally the other day, the U.S. UN Association produced an article clearly demonstrating that it is an association not for cooperating with the UN, but for countering it. In essence it questions all of the main provisions of the UN Charter and proposes measures that will liquidate the UN. The Soviet Union, however, considers that the experience accumulated by that organization makes it possible to galvanize its activities, to step them up, and enhance the role of all its services and institutions. This concerns both the Economic and Social Council, and UNESCO, and so on and so forth.

[Shishlin] But first and foremost the Security Council.

[Levin] But first...quite correct...first and foremost the Security Council. We are even proposing—and this is a very interesting proposal by Mikhail Sergeyevich in the article we are discussing today—to enhance the Security Council's role and occasionally to hold the Security Council conference at the foreign ministerial level in the capitals of the permanent UN member states. I fully realize that the reaction in the United States to these proposals will now be far from the simple, if only for the fact that for several years now the United States has been on the attack. In 1986, for example, the United States incurred a debt of $247 million to the UN, that is, it did not pay the money due. Another instance, for example, which on the whole demonstrates unequivocally the United State's stance, was its withdrawal from UNESCO. The USA is dissatisfied with the nited Nation's present role and present actions, or to put it even more simply, it is dissatisfied at having lost the possibility of manipulating that organization.

[Tsvetov] The thing is here, you understand, that the United States is not only dissatisfied with the UN'S activities, but it would like to turn the United Nations into the same sort of organ that the League of Nations used to be.

At that time in Europe there was a joke going around that very accurately showed what the League of Nations had degenerated into: In a conversation one person asks the other that if the desire of a great nation to swallow a small one causes a conflict, what will the other great nations, members of the League, do? The other person replies that they will try to prevent this evil deed. The first person then asks: What if the great nation insists on its desire to eat its little neighbor for a snack? The second person replies: Then the other great nations will issue an order that it should eat it up, but on behalf of them all, and the prestige of the League of Nations will be saved. This is approximately the kind of organization that the United States would like to turn the United Nations into. But now times have changed and the epoch is different.

[Shishlin] But I do not think that everybody in the United States has a negative attitude towards the United Nations. There are quite influential political forces there which have a good understanding of what the United Nations means for the life of the world community and advocate that the United Nations should function, well, quite normally. Coming back to the contents of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's article it seems to me that the remarkable feature of this article is its very constructive tone. In actual fact, no accusations are being made against anyone whatsoever there. In actual fact, no accusations are being made against anyone whatsoever there. Nor does it attempt to seriously reflect upon the history of international relations or prhaps, even on modern dramatic times. Rather it tries rather to draw lessons from dramatic modern days and outline routes for resolving the problems that so heavily burden international relations today.

[Tsvetov] In his article Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev touches on many diverse aspects of international relations. It not only discusses nuclear disarmament but also elimination of conventional and chemical weapons. In other words, it creates a perfectly clearcut picture of how the Soviet Union views international relations in the foreseeable future, and puts forward absolutely specific and distinct proposals for the solution of any of those very topical problems with which humanity is now faced.

[Shishlin] Well, yes, for instance, conventional weapons. Much is being said in the West to the effect that there is a balance in conventional weapons between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Well, this is quite a contrived thesis, counting and recounting still has to be done there. We propose this method: If there is an imbalance somewhere, then this imbalance should be eliminated by bringing down the level.

[Levin] I would also like to draw attention to that provision in the article which describes verification [kontrol]. For indeed, at present, previously unprecedented standards of openness [otkrytost], glasnost, and the volume and depth of mutual monitoring [proverka] and verification of the obligations assumed are being established.

U.S. military experts expressed doubt as to whether military exercises in Belorussia were being conducted within the existing parameters. They said: We would like to carry out an inspection. Twelve hours later they were on site. This is an unprecedented case. U.S. congressmen have had the opportunity to visit the Krasnoyarsk radar statinon that is under construction. They were shown everything there. They were told everything. U.S. scientists together with our experts are setting up and adjusting their instruments in the region of a Soviet nuclear test site. Soviet and U.S. observers are present at the other's military exercises. These facts show we have entered a fundamentally new stage in this very delicate matter.

[Shishlin] The problems of verification you raised are, of course, extremely important and extremely essential. In this case the roles have completely changed. Previously

the Soviet Union's attitude toward U.S. ideas on implementing some sort of total verification of all and everything was indeed very cautious. At present, it seems, the wide-scale Soviet proposals on verification, all-penetrating verification indeed, are making the United States clam up. They are the ones who are afraid of this verification.

[Levin] Perhaps, one can draw a conclusion that our approach to the problems of verification has played by no means the least part, in that during the talks between Comrade Shevardnadze and Shultz in Washington an accord was achieved to start full-scale bilateral talks on limitation and ultimately complete banning of nuclear tests. Right up until now, even if one recalls the talks of George Shultz in Moscow this spring, the U.S. stance was this: Let us talk about verification of nuclear tests, but we do not want to talk about a complete ban of nuclear tests. Now they have agreed to this. The USSR'S consistent and clear stand has resulted in progress being achieved in this very important matter.

What is involved here, of course, as I imagine, is a stage-by-stage solution of the problem. Let it be so. Let it be so. The other side is not ready for an instantaneous ban on nuclear testing. Let us move, by way of enhancing verification through to ratifying the threshold treaties of 1974 and 1976. These treaties have determined the maximum yield of nuclear tests as 150 kilotonnes. Of course, the fundamental importance of the accord, in my view, consists in that it is nevertheless proceeding towards a complete ban of nuclear tests. I am afraid that this route will not be short, but the important thing is that the goal has been defined. This is organically tied up with the problem of monitoring that we have been talking about.

[Tsvetov] Amongst those responses abroad to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's article which I mentioned at the very beginning, my attention has been attracted by some comments of various U.S. military experts and some U.S. political scientists. From their perspective, one of the most important points outlined in the article is a mention of the USSR'S military doctrine and military sufficiency.

[Shishlin] On the whole, the United States is somewhat afraid that the Soviet Union, seeing the way the general situation is taking shape, will declare that we have had enough of arms build-up; we have sufficient forces and means to give a worthy response, in the event of unforeseen circumstances, to any challenge. The U.S. is, of course, rather afraid of this. But in fact the principle of reasonable sufficiency is formulated on the basis of a very precise evaluation of what both the Soviet Union and the United States have at their disposal. Mikhail Sergeyevich's article does in fact mention that even if 95 percent of the nuclear arsenals at the disposal of the Soviet Union and the United States were removed today, military-strategic parity will still be reliably ensured. For in itself the concept of nuclear deterrence does not stand up to criticism at all: It is a senseless, absurd concept to think that peace is maintained only as a consequence of the fact that there are bombs. We have them; the United States has them; a number of other nuclear states have them. It one adheres to this concept, who knows where the world will end up tomorrow, who will possess bombs. Who knows what will happen to the hopes and dream of a nuclear-free world, which is quite simply necessary for mankind to cope not only with the problem of overcoming the arms race or with regional conflicts, but with overcoming underdevelopment and backwardness.

[Tsvetov] It seems to me that one should remind our radio listeners what comes under the concept of military sufficiency. Well, as you have already pointed out, the political aspect consists of the fact that it is a profoundly defensive doctine. Priority is given to a political settlement of issues, not a military one. The task posed is that of maintaining political stability by means of strictly-controlled [kontroliruyemyy] arms limitation and reduction. That is the political aspect.

The military aspect consists of the following: military might should be such that there are no grounds to fear for security; while on the other hand, they should give every country the confidence that it can deflect an attack if it occurs. Finally, the economic aspect. Military sufficiency makes it possible to free huge sums for peaceful construction, for aid to developing countries, for development of science, culture, and so on.

[Levin] In this connection, it is worth going back to the recent international conference on the mutual link between disarmament and development. These ideas were also clearly reflected in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's article. When I was preparing for our program, I looked back at old documents and saw that fundamentally important ideas about the mutual link between disarmament and development were expressed in the 15 January 1986 statement by the CPSU Cental Committee general secretary. We all remember this statement as a decument of great importance, in which the task of eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000 is proclaimed. At the same time, a thesis of fundamental importance concerning the problem at issue was expressed there: The principle imposed by imperialism of "arms instead of development" must give way to the reverse order of things—disarmament for development. We are putting forward very clear and very specific proposals on this issue. We think it would be useful to discuss the problems of development and disarmament at a special meeting of the top leaders of the UN Security Council member countries. The realization of the fundamental principle—disarmament for development—must and can unite mankind, and help to form mankind's universal awareness. We are ready, for out part, to immmediately assume the obligation to allocate the money liberated as a result of disarmament—a certain proportion of this money—to the development fund, and even to set up an international fund, Disarmament for Development.

[Tsvetov] It should be stressed here, though, that this has nothing to do with philanthropy. This is a very important, very far-sighted step and a very far-sighted proposal, because Milhail Sergeyevich quite rightly says that the world is confronted not only by the threat of nuclear destruction, but also by a no less terrible danger engendered as a consequence of hungry and deprived people in the world, that the developing world is fettered in a web of debts. Our radio listeners will understand just how dangerous the present situation of the developing countries is, when I say that they owe the developed countries almost $1 trillion dollars: This is dangerous because these can be repaid neither in theory nor in practice. Secondly, there is the paradox that it is simply not advantageous to the Western countries and the multinational corporations to have the debt paid off. Why? Because in order to repay its debt—let us suppose that some country or other owes $20 billion—it must sharply increase its exports and make a sharp cut in imports, so that the difference amounts exactly to those $20 billion. But what does sharply increasing its exports mean? It means flooding the developed capitalist countries with their goods which they will not allow. What does making a sharp cut in imports mean? It means banning the multinational corporations and the developed capitalist countries from importing their goods into the developing world. But the next thing is that the developing countries are continuing to amass this debt, because the interest payments have to be paid, and each new credit goes to pay off the interest, while the sum of this credit is added to the previous debt. So the debt grows, with no end in sight. And it is here that there arises a tangle of such burning contradictions which could lead to very dangerous consequences, consequences no less dangerous than a muclear conflict.

[Shishlin] Here the efforts of many heads and many states and many economic centers are needed to find some rational solution, not on the principle of helping the rich get richer while the poor get poorer. International work on it should be organized. Essentially, those problems we are discussing require not simply routine conferences, they really require active work by the minds of all members of the world community.

[Levin] And actions, too.

[Shishlin] And actions too, without fail.

[Levin] Well now, the Soviet Union is proposing very specific actions, very specific ones. And although this article appeared at a time when the negotiations in Washington had already begun between Comrade Shevardnadze and George Shultz, the article touched upon nearly all the problems being discussed at these negotiations. In particular it touched on the problem of eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, and the problem of a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, under conditions of strict observance of the ABM treaty.

[Shishlin] It must altogether be said that oohs and aahs are resounding in the West over this article by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, primarily from the U.S. mass media. Aah, how can it be that just when such crucial negotiations between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state are underway, that Gorbachev publicly and for all to see is expounding the entire concept of Soviet foreign policy approaches towards the most topical problems of modern international life?

Why all these oohs and aahs? Well, because the very process of internationalization of the discussion on acute international problems, of course, limits the scope for maneuvre for opponents of real agreements, opponents of real accords. I do not ascribe the word "opponents" to the present U.S. Administration entirely, all the more so in that on the whole, one must acknowledge and point out that the talks and the intensive discussions which Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze conducted in the U.S. capital, both with President Reagan and with the U.S. secretary of state, were productive, meaningful, and profound. They were undoubtedly crowned by a certain perceptible rapprochement in positions on a number of very important issues.

[Tsvetov] Indeed, on Friday Comrade Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz signed a joint statement in which they pointed out that they had reached agreement in principle on concluding an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, and that the delegations of both countries in Geneva had been given instructions to step up their work on coordinating the remaining technical questions in order to draw up the text of a draft treaty as rapidly as possible. This treaty will be signed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan during their meeting at the end of 1987.

What is the significance of this treaty? If one regards the matter from the military point of view, only 3 percent of the nuclear weapon units from both sides will be subject to reduction. But the political significance of the treaty is unusually great. For the first time in 8 years, the USSR and United States will be able to come to agreement on the problem of nuclear disarmament. A major breakthrough will be made in this problem, since for the first time in history two powers will agree to eliminate two systems of weapons which took a long time to develop [razrabatyvatsya], a long time to build and deploy [razmeshchatsya], and at a great expense for both sides. Now, one must hope, the way will be opened for fresh, even more significant agreements in the sphere of nuclear disarmament.

[Shishlin] When the general result of the Shultz-Shevardnadze talks is assessed some sort of ultraoptimistic schedule for the further development of Soviet-U.S. relations can be imagined. A pessimistic schedule for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations can also be imagined, because not all issues have been resolved. Which should one lean toward—the super optimistic option, or the pessimistic option? Evidently the truth here lies

somewhere in the middle. Quite a large amount of difficult work, By no means easy work, lies ahead; but what has been done is of course an appreciable step forward, an appreciable step forward.

I would like to say that, yes, this is of course thanks to the Soviet position of taking the initiative. But to a certain degree it is also thanks to Washington, because they have agreed with a whole series of Soviet proposals, they met the Soviet Union halfway on a number of matters. It was by no means a one-sided affair, but it was genuinely joint work, difficult work, because, to put it bluntly, we have as yet very little experience of such work.

[Tsvetov] Well, to sum up our discussion today, I would like to return to the idea I expressed right at the beginning: namely that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's article provides an opportunity to realize and interpret what the new political thinking is. When I read that article, I remembered that only just quite recently our conception consisted of the following: In the event of an outbreak of nuclear war, socialism would still remain stronger than nuclear horrors. But now we frankly declare that there can be no victor in a nuclear war. Further, reading this article, I remembered our conception—likewise comparatively recently—that if we are weaker than the United States in any weapons, especially nuclear weapons, then for the sake of our own security we must catch up with the United States in these weapons. Whereas now we consider that both the USSR and the United States possess such a quantity of nuclear weapons that they are capable of destroying one another many times over.

And this change in our way of thinking, this change in our assessment of what is going on in the world, found very clear expression in the article which we have been discussing here with you. Thank you for your attention, good bye!

Moscow TV Program Discusses Human Rights

LD252152 [Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1445 GMT on 24 September carries a 45-minute roundtable discussion program entitled "Glasnost is an International Concept" on questions concerning human rights. The discussion is chaired by Professor Avgust Alekseyevish Mishin, doctor of law at Moscow State University, with RSFSR Justice Minister Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the *Novosti* press agency board; Historian Doctor Vladimir Viktorovich Sogrin; Historian Doctor Mikhail Matveyevich Norinskiy; Historian Doctor Valeriy Aleksandrovich Tishkov; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy chief editor of *Izvestiya*; Moscow television political observer Dmitriy Biryukov; Gian Filippo Benedetti, Italian senator and history professor; Betram Gross, U.S. professor of economics and history, and author of "Friendly Fascism;" Professor Michel Lesage, director of the Institute for Research into Comparative Law, Ivry-sur-Seine, France; French journalist Jacques Arnault; and London *The Guardian* journalist Jonathan Steele. All participants are identified from screen captions, and are shown seated at a long table covered with notes, national flags and bottles of mineral water; interpreters sit behind the speakers and relay translations through earpieces.

The discussion is opened by Falin, who says: "To a large extent in our discussions on this problem of human rights we make use not of facts but of standard stereotypes, those stereotypes which a person, often unbeknownst to hinself, takes in—according to their age—from the very atmosphere of society, sucks in from the soil on which he lives, from the air he breathes. We have no doubt that, for example, the creation of the United States of America in the 17th century was to some extent a major turning point in the history not only of the Western hemisphere but of the whole of human society. The U.S. Constitution, adopted 200 years ago, was a definite milestone in the coming about of the development of the concept of statehood and democracy and of human rights.

It is just as difficult to dispute—obviously in an objective analysis—the great colossal qualitative influence of the October Revolution, which took place in our country 70 years ago, the effect of this revolution, a revolution not only of state but above all of society, which marked the brith of a new social and societal formation on everything that has happened in the world after 1917. Correspondingly, our Constitution and our concept of human rights has made its noticeable mark. It has left and is leaving such a mark on everything that happens in the world, but there is a need and requirement for assessments in the West as to what has been and what is adequate for the real content of what has happened. We often do not find them; and this creates the basis for many complications and even conflicts."

Gross, who speaks in English with superimposed Russian translation throughout, continues the discussion by saying:

"I believe that we have to deal in detail not only with the question as to what to consider as human rights, but also with the prerequisites for ensuring these rights. I have been trying to study the question as to why certain groupings in the U.S. Administration consider as unacceptable the proposal of Mr Gorbachev to hold an international conference on human rights. It is true that I have unfortunately had no opportunity to familiarize myself with the actual document, although I have been able to talk with one of the official representatives of the U.S. Commission on questions of the Helsinki Agreement. Do you know what he said? He said that if I go to Moscow and there support the Soviet proposal they will love me very much. By the way, I have nothing against this. However, it is a matter of something else. Of course, the proposal for holding an international conference on human rights is of historical significance, and it is of course based on the Helsinki Agreements, though I myself do not consider these actual agreements the basis of my own personal concept, my own understanding of human rights.

"If such a conference is to be held then it must not become any kind of regional meeting, that is, European, even though Europe thinks of itself as the center of the world. It is not worth holding such a conference in the Latin American continent either, if only because in many countries there the situation of guaranteeing human rights is very far removed from perfection. I think that before assembling this kind of conference two international conventions would have to be worked out, one concerning the ensuring of civil and political rights, and the other economic, social and cultural rights. By the way, time is also needed so that the United states can ratify the documents concerning human rights—international documents.

"In summing up my address I would like to stress that we must approach the problem of real guarantees for human rights in their historical development, and examine how it is implemented in practice and not only in printed documents. Only then can we make a viable contribution to solving the tasks facing us."

Steele, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation throughout then comments: "Britain is one of the few countries in the world that has no written constitution. I am therefore somewhat skeptical as to the Constitutions of other countries when expounded on paper. Besides, as a journalist who does a lot of travelling throughout the world, I often see an enormous gap between what governments say in one country or another about guaranteeing human rights, and what the security forces and the police forces do in these very countries. What happens on the streets of the capitals of many countries refutes the statements that civil rights are guaranteed. That is why I am cautious of discussions about human rights. It seems to me that above all, more attention should be directed toward how people live, for the better are their living conditions, the greater their opportunities for experiencing freedom. It also seems to me that the theme of human rights is not one of leading importance for discussion at an interstate level just now. We must above all discuss this problem within one or another society. Indeed, the question as to what relations are established in a country between its government and its people is an internal one. Of course, it is essential to achieve the kind of situation whereby human rights can be discussed by people openly within the countries where they live and not at an intergovernmental level."

Sukharev responds: "I listened with great interest to Mr Gross' and Mr Steele's remarks. These are very interesting considerations and remarks. I would simply like to confirm their wishes, so to speak, that we should approach the question and problems of rights and freedoms historically and conceptually, and not simply, as sometimes happens, with us comparing the texts of constitutions and corresponding laws. This is not a very productive approach, as experience shows. We in the Soviet Union, brought up on Lenin's ideas, pay a great tribute of respect both to the French Bourgeois Revolution and to the American Revolution and U.S. Constitution, which were indeed an enormous historical step in the march of world civilization. It was none other than Lenin, a revolutionary and Marxist, who said that we, in bringing about this revolution, must remember that it is not a cause which starts off in a vacuum. When we read and listen to very unflattering expressions about bourgeois democracy in polemics in our newspapers, particularly in newspapers in Western countries, about our socialist democracy, then you involuntarily think, when you stop and analyze these polemics, if let us say, rights are everywhere violated in the Soviet Union, there are no freedoms, no elementary rights for expression of your own thoughts, no creative opportunities or inclinations, you ask yourself—who in 70 years brought this country with its subordinate people, to the highest heights of civilizations, to the highest heights of scientific and technical progress, culture and art, which not only Soviet people but also many people in the West are proud of and enjoy."

Senator Benedetti then talks about the question of citizens' rights in participating in solving a country's problems, and what opportunities they have to change unfavorable situations. He says that the USSR and the United States are dutybound to cooperation in searching for ways to guarantee human rights. He regrets that there is a lack of dialogue between the two superpowers. He says that U.S. Constitution is only drawn into public attention when its statutes are violated, while the Soviet Constitution has a more comprehensive approach, enshrining legal protection for the rights cited in it.

The discussion is then take up by Dr Sogrin, who says: "The year 1917 for the first time introduced into human rights practice two new and fundamental spheres, social and economic rights. The U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Constitution categorically refuse to recognize social and economic rights as fundamental. All in all, this serves to narrow the field of development of human rights practice in the United States. Another aspect I would like to stress is that human rights truly are indivisible, and I am a long way from saying... I consider it incorrect when the kind of viewpoint is put forward that the Soviet Union is better because we have social and economic rights, and the Americans, for their part, say that they are better, because they have highly-developed political rights. As a Soviet Citizen, it is very nice and most pleasing for me that now our state and our communist party have firmly taken up this view, that without the realization and development of political rights, social and economic rights are left hanging, and could, to a considerable extent, lose their real significance."

Biryukov, sitting next to Gross, then says: "In the interval I Met Professor Gross, and I want to ask him a question." He turns to Gross, and says: "I have one question for you: I think you know what the Russian word glasnost means—openness [otkrytost] In the established sense of the word openness. In this connection I would like to ask you why the U.S. mass media assessing,

the situation in our country, do not follow the principle of glasnost themselves. Formally they use the word glasnost, but in effect they do not. Do you agree with me or not"?

Gross responds: "Your question, it seems to me, is rather naive. You erroneously think that the U.S. press does not act like this in respect of various aspects of U.S. life. It does not cover everything that happens in the United States fully enough. News in the United States is a business, it is selling the means of control over minds, the news is one kind of advertizing. Millions of people working in our mass media might be dissatisfied with this situation; that is how it is. So, please, do not think that our press discriminates against the Soviet Union in particular. I think that discrimination applies fully also to the things that worry Americans."

Biryukov asks: "And what about observing human rights, the right to obtain information"?

Gross answers by saying: "In this sense the U.S. press is directed against Americans. This applies to the majority of the mass media: Television is a very expensive business, radio a little cheaper. But it is not easy to gain access to them. When my book "Friendly Fascism!" was published, I planned to travel round the entire country and speak about the reasons for my critical appraisal of life in the United States on the radio stations of the major companies. However, I managed to do this at only 25 small radio stations, and the only national television and radio company accessible to me was the Canadian one. I was given the opportunity on U.S. television of taking part in two very early morning shows. The major companies do not want to put anything in their programs that accurately reflects the American reality, and the distortion of the situation in other countries is also astounding."

The video at this point cuts back to shows the roundtable discussion, and a caption reads: continuation of discussion. Lesage is shown reading from an edition of *Moskovskiye Novosti* carrying an interview with Sukharev, and he outlines why he agrees with his premises that we need to cooperate, as we all live on the same planet.

The discussion continues with Norinskiy saying: "It is indisputable that the great bourgeois revolution, the American Revolution and the French Revolution, breaking the feudal rules, the feudal system and feudal barriers, signified colossal progress in the development of both the concept and practice of human rights and, it seems to me, one could say that the bourgeois theories and concepts of human rights for a long time stressed the rights of the individual, of the person, per se. Therefore, when talking about the principally new elements that were, all in all, brought in by the Great October Revolution, and that the practice of socialism introduced to these the concepts of human rights, I think one can also say that attention was directed toward the rights of the collective, the rights of the group, in as much as human rights are implemented not only by the individual, they are also implemented through a specific collective, a specific group, and it is here that the Great October contributed an absolutely new approach. I think that one can also talk of yet another thing that was new in principle, the principle of compensation for groups, such as national, ethnic groups, in some kind of situation lacking equal rights—what the French call underprivileged groups—was somehow asserted and introduced in society, into social practice. This principle of compensation for these groups was also introduced in the general practice of socialism, and now, one way or another, is generally recognised by the majority of specialists in human rights."

Arnault, speaking in French with superimposed Russian translation, says that he thinks they are all agreed that there can be no civil and political rights without economic guarantees, and goes on to ask why it is that the poor rarely take part in elections, and that the richer people become the more politically active they become.

The video cuts to Biryukov seated with Jonathan Steele, who speaks in Russian. Biryukov says: "Another break in the discussion and another interview. This time, with Mr Steele, the diplomatic observer of the newspaper *The Guardian*. He turns to Steele, and asks: "Mr Steele, you of course know our terms glasnost and perestroyka, you know about the policy that is now being implemented in our country. Do you think that this is a positive contribution to the problem of guaranteeing human rights? Steele responds by saying: "Of course this is very important, this development, this perestroyka here in the Soviet Union. I think that no society can function, in the full sense, without perestroyka and glasnost within this society. I would even say that I think that it is very important that you have not just got perestroyka for 1 year, or for 5 years, but a continuous perestroyka." Biryukov then asks: "Is perestroyka taking place in the Western news media when covering events in our country?" to which Steele says: "I think so. This depends, of course, on the press. We have a variety of newspapers, a variety of views represented on television. But I think that there is a very great interest now among our peoples in the West, very immense interest now in everything that is happening in the Soviet Union."

Biryukov then speaks: "Here's a striking thing: Most often we are criticized by the West in the field of human rights. Today, this roundtable discussion, which is, I think, an interesting one, is taking place. We invited Western correspondents accredited in Moscow, specifically the Americans. Nobody came. Isn't that astounding?"

Steele says: "Yes. Of course, I am not in agreement with them, because I am here. I think that this is probably a mistake, because it is also a very important development in that you are now concentrating on the human rights issue, and also that you have invited [as heard] an international conference within the framework of the Helsinki Treaty [as heard] which will now take place in Moscow next year. I think that this is very important

step forward and I hope this conference enjoys the wide participation of all countries, West and East, of Europe". Biryukov thanks Steele, and the camera switches back to the roundtable discussion.

The discussion continues with Yefimov saying: "When you look at our history you can see very clearly the principle, our approach, or if you like, our fundamental philosophy regarding human rights—that of moving from a formal declaration to a position in which we guarantee people these rights and freedoms. And not just people, but each person—and I stress the word— each. Not a minority, and not even a majority, but each person. This in itself gives rise to a mass of problems and complications for us, but that is the principle. We have had four constitutions in the course of our short history. The first was adopted in 1918, the first year of the revolution. The second, 7 years later in 1924 [as heard], the third was adopted in 1936, and the last one has been in force now for 10 years, since 1977. It's when you compare these constitutions that you notice that gradually, step by step, we have, first of all, filled out the very concepts of human rights with more and more new and profound content. This does not mean that we have not made mistakes along the way, or that there were no dead-end decisions at various times; all these things occurred. The objective, however, and the direction are invariably present in all four of our constitutions—for each person."

Tishkov comments, stating: "I think that for a long time here in the USSR we have been holding a position of what I would call passive defense as regards human rights. It seems to me that today we ought to thank the Carter administration for, so to speak, raising this issue in 1977, and progress further. That is, from a position of sort of defense, or protecting ourselves—I have my own Soviet colleagues in mind here—to more vigorous actions in defense of human rights around the world as a whole. I have to say that the situation regarding this is very alarming in many countries. Another question also arises in this connection: Why...we say that...human rights problems and situations arise in those places where those rights are violated...where they do not exist. As a general rule, the origin of the problem lies in people's desire to change, or rather to improve the social conditions of their existence. That's what lies at the bottom, so to speak, of the majority, the overwhelming majority of problems. How do you reconcile the problem of peace and the problem of social progress, or revolution, if you prefer? Why is it that 200 years ago the Americans had the right to a revolution, whereas today certain peoples who have exhausted all peaceful means—why should we say to them: No, only non violent [last word spoken in English] Only nonviolent actions. Of course, there is Gandhi's theory, or Tolstoy's. They are very good, and achieved a great deal in the world. However, there are specific situations, such as South Africa, Guatemala, Chile, and a number of other countries, where the theory—the nonviolent approach, passive resistence—has, in my view, produced no results over many years, and people can be driven to a situation in which they are forced to resort to stronger means."

The video shows the roundtable participants seated on a stage addressing an audience of Moscow students—identified by caption—on the results of their debate.

Mishin is first to speak, saying: "I am bound to report to you that the conference passed off—I'm not talking officialese here, but to the point—in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and mutual respect. That does not mean that our Western colleagues agreed with us on everything: They all spoke in praise of restructuring, but certain other aspects of our life they did not praise—criticizing them in an amicable way. Nor does it mean that we agreed with everything that is going on in the Western countries. Naturally, we were unable to adopt any constructive decisions which might promote the final implementation of all internal state and international documents concerning civil rights and freedoms, but in my view we achieved a great deal."

An unidentied student introduces himself as being "from the Institute of International Relations," and asks: "It has just been mentioned that the problem of human rights is, above all, an ideological and political one. Did you find common ground upon which to seek further solutions to the problem?"

Falin responds by saying: "In order to understand each other correctly we formulated the following thesis: One cannot bring the problem of human rights down to legal concepts; one cannot abstract oneself from the fact that in each system one's view of the problem is ideologically and politically slanted, and in a number of cases, primarily political and ideological. As for the common denominator that has to be sought and found...after all, if we fail to find it then we shall not find a foundation for ensuring mankind's immortality. There is one thing which could be, and probably should be, that denominator: Man must become man. That is, we must uncover in ourselves, first and foremost, human qualities and virtues, and what is perhaps the toughest task to solve, one should uncover just such merits and qualities in others.

Another student introduces himself as "(Anatoliy Koverin) from the Institute of State and Law," he asks: "My first question is for Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev. International conventions and the constitutions of civilized states all enshrine practically one and the same collection of human rights, yet we all realize that various meanings are invested in them. What ways are there, in your view, Aleksandr Yakovlevich, for overcoming this kind of specualative approach to the norms...to the human rights enshrined in constitutions or in conventions and pacts?

Sukharev answers: "If we all proceed from the assumption that each nation has its traditions, its history and its values—things that nation has gained through suffering and which it cherishes—if we can master this basic commandment, so to speak, then of course it will be

easier for us to talk, easier for us to understand international pacts, agreements and treaties, and easier to understand each country's domestic legislation and constitution. That's the main thing. But if we proceed from the assumption that there are certain standards, and if someone aspires to make those standards rules for other states and perhaps even for the entire world, then of course, and particularly in today's world, this will first of all fail, and secondly, will be fraught with very serious complications and repercussions."

Sukharev then answers a question on restructuring and the Western system, and is followed by Lesage who says that we have to understand each other better.

An unidentified narrator says: "The meeting lasted about 3 hours. The questions came one after another, often even straying beyond the nominal topic of discussion, but this is understandable, for the 2-day debate showed that the problems relating to guaranteeing human rights in various countries are connected with the specific conditions in which their citizens live. Moreover, the past is important as well: Even many countries now building a new life can still feel the severe legacy of colonialism. Eventually, answers were given to all the questions put by the students, and the exchange of views came to an end. Now here's our last interview."

Lesage is then asked: "do you think that meetings like our roundtable and the accompanying press conference are interesting and useful? And if so, why?

Lesage speaking in French with superimposed Russian translation, says: "I can say quitge sincerely that I consider this meeting with the students very interesting. For more than 20 years I have been taking part in a dialogue with my colleagues, Soviet lawyers, and it is perfectly obvious to me that the last 2 years can be considered as a new phase in the development of the Soviet political system. And as the Soviet Union refines its legislation, resolving a large number of problems, the dialogue with Soviet lawyers on human rights problems becomes, quite naturally, more and more important. It is also obvious to me that differences remain, considerable ones, on such problems as freedom of movement and freedom to express one's views. However, I think that it is essential to clarify precisely where these differences lie, in what ways our basic points of view differ, and what methods can be used to bring them closer together. What struck me most about our debate was the atmosphere of great freedom of self-expression and the frank exchange of views."

Lesage's remarks conclude the program.

United States & Canada

Bush Arrives in Poland, Meets Jaruzelski

PM290915 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "At State Council's Invitation"]

[Text] Warsaw, 27 Sep—U.S. Vice President G. Bush arrived here yesterday on an official visit at the invitation of the Polish State Council and Government.

On the same day he met with W. Jaruzelski, chairman of the Polish State Council. During their talk there was an exchange of opinions on key issues of bilateral relations between Poland and the United States. The sides informed each other of the domestic situation in their countries and touched on key international problems, in particular questions of disarmament and cooperation between states with different sociopolitical systems.

Bush Involvement in Contra Affair Alleged

LD280929 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Washington September 28 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin reports:

An official from the office of the U.S. Vice-President George Bush read as follows: The purpose of the meeting: Felix Rodriguez, expert in quelling rebel actions, informs about the nature of war in El Salvador and resumption of aid to the contras. The participants: vice-president, K. Fuller, D. Gregg, S. Watson, F. Rodriguez. May 1, 1986.

The photocopy of the declassified document was published by the weekly *Congressional Quarterly*. It bears out once more that Bush, who keeps charging that he is not implicated in the "Iran-contras" scandal, in actual fact knew fairly well about the covert weapons shipments to the gangs of Somoza followers in circumvention of the congressional ban and, moreover, met in prison with people who directly carried out these operations.

It is exactly Felix Rodriguez, the former CIA agent "Max Gomez", who was recruited in 1985 by Lieutenant-Colonel Oliver North, a National Security Council aide at that time, to give "technical" guidance to the supply of weapons to the contras.

In his turn, Rodriguez was recommended to Bush by his national security aide Donald Gregg. Officially, the point at issue at that time was aid to the Salvadoran Government in the fight against left-wing rebels. However, even U.S. newspapers skeptically accept a possibility that Bush's aides did not inform him about the other sides of Max Gomez's activity.

The weekly writes that Bush, who will soon announce his intention to seek a Republican presidential nomination, can seriously suffer politically if the public gets convinced that he knew about the "Irangate" more than he says.

A public opinion poll conducted by the newspaper *USA Today* showed that in the eyes of the majority of Americans Bush was associated more than everyone else with President Reagan's course of support for the Nicaraguan contras.

Dubinin Gives Gorbachev Reply to Physician

LD290402 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0315 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Washington, 29 Sep (TASS)—Yuriy Dubinin, the USSR ambassador to the United States, received Bernard Lown, cochairman of the international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War." Dubinin handed him the text of the reply from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the telegram of greetings Lown sent in connection with the agreement in principle on the conclusion of a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, reached during the talks held by Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign affairs minister, in Washington.

Lown expressed his profound thanks for the attention paid to him by M.S. Gorbachev, and stated that in this he sees yet another manifestation of the Soviet leadership's adherence to the policy of eliminating nuclear weapons, which is in tune with the work of the organization he heads.

Cuomo Discusses Results of Moscow Visit

LD242150 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Sep 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The visit of Mario Cuomo, governor of New York State, to Moscow, has finished. Before flying to Leningrad he gave an interview for the Vremya program.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified journalist, in English, with superimposed Russian translation] Mr Governor, what is your assessment of the results of your talks with Soviet officials?

[Cuomo, in English, with superimposed Russian translation] I think they went brilliantly. I think Soviet officials sincerely want a corresponding agreement [as heard] to be signed, which will allow the number of missiles on both sides to be reduced by 50 percent, and medium- and shorter-range missiles to be removed from Europe. They are ready to hold talks on the reduction of conventional weapons. I think your side will take a constructive position at those talks. The Soviet side will not let its defenses be undermined. There is still an absence of complete trust in the United States. But, after all, the Soviet Union still does not have complete trust in us, either. Perhaps that will happen some time. But it can be said with assurance now that the Soviet side does not want to spend vast sums of money any more on weapons of mass destruction, which will never be used. The Soviet

leadership would like to use that money to raise the standard of living of its people, and on economic restructuring. The United States is in the same mood. Apart from that, a reduction in nuclear weapons—by reducing them—we lessen the possibility of their accidental use. In my view, by pursuing the path of reducing arms we will arrive at the point of demilitarization. Instead of militarization we will be able to get involved in healthy commercial competition, in trade, and business relations.

[Journalist] From your statement I understand that you take an optimistic view of the future of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Cuomo] Now I am more optimistic regarding the signing of an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, and also on missiles in Europe, and so-called heavy strategic missiles. I am in a more optimistic frame of mind now than 4 days ago. [end recording]

Canadian Parliamentarians Arrive in Moscow

LD262045 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 26 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—A group of deputies of the Canadian Parliament arrived in Moscow today at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

The MPs were met at the airport by Valentina Tereshkova, a deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, other officials and by Vernon Turner, Canada's ambassador to the Soviet Union.

China

Far East Institute Chief on Ties With PRC

PM281419 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Article by Doctor of Philosophic Sciences M. Titarenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the Far East: "USSR-China: For The Further Development of Cooperation"—sentences within slantlines constitute introductory paragraphs and are published in boxes; boldface as published]

[Text] Recent years have been marked by a substantial improvement of relations between the USSR and the PRC. The contours of bilateral cooperation are expanding more and more and are being filled out with new content. The level of contacts between statesmen of the two countries is rising.

Since December 1984 exchanges of visits by the deputy heads of government of both countries have been held regularly. A number of meetings between foreign ministers of the USSR and the PRC have been held at the time when UN General Assemblies have been in session. Political consultations on bilateral and also on the most important international issues are conducted on a permanent basis, border talks have been resumed, and sessions of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation are held.

The resumption of links between the legislative organs after a 20-year break was significant in the normalization of Soviet-Chinese interstate relations. These contacts have already now assumed a permanent nature. Thus, in July 1987 a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Legislative Proposals Commission [singular as published], headed by G.P. Razumovskiy, met with Chinese parliamentarians in the PRC, while in August this year our country was visited by a delegation of the Chinese National People's Congress Nationalities Committee, headed by its vice chairman, Yu Wen.

In 1987 a new consular treaty entered into force, in accordance with which general consulates of the USSR and of the PRC were opened in Shanghai and Leningrad. The 2-year (1986-1987) plan for cultural cooperation is being successfully implemented and links are being established between trade union, women's, and youth organizations, and also friendship societies.

The volume of reciprocal trade is growing rapidly. Over the period 1981-1986 it has increased in value terms some 10-fold, reaching R1,822,000,000.

Facts attesting to the expansion and deepening of Soviet-Chinese cooperation cannot fail to cause profound satisfaction in our country. Obviously, the improvement of relations between the two biggest socialist powers is of important significance for the destiny of world peace and the cause of socialism. History has placed upon the Soviet and Chinese peoples a special responsibility, above all for the preservation of the peaceful situation in Asia.

The development of Soviet-Chinese relations in the course of the implementation of economic reforms on a broad scale in both countries, aimed at the improvement of the socialist system and the revelation of its advantages, presupposes the broad exchange of experience of construction in all spheres, and is a powerful stimulating factor for the accelerated implementation of the aims and tasks of restructuring and modernization in the direction of a radical upturn in the well-being of the Soviet and Chinese peoples. In the coming 21st century the outcome of the historic peaceful rivalry between the two sociopolitical systems will depend to a great extent on the successes of restructuring in the USSR and the reforms in the PRC and in other socialist countries.

The most important methodological reference point in our country's approach to China, and, likewise, to other world problems since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum is the concept of new political thinking. It makes it possible rapidly and consistently to purge negative accretions of the past from our relations and to impart to them a truly equitable, mutually advantageous nature, taking into account the current and long-term national interests of each other. On the practical plane this has made it possible to impart due dynamism and flexibility to the foreign policy line of the USSR in the development of links with our great socialist neighbor. The philosophy of the new political thinking requires that one listens to and understands other

countries and peoples, that one places common interests and aims and similar or nearly similar aspects of domestic and foreign policy at the focus of relations, and that one examines them in the broad context of worldwide links and interests.

The idea of a comprehensive approach toward ensuring peace and security in Asia and the Pacific, outlined by M.S. Gorbachev in Vladivostok, is most directly linked with Soviet-Chinese relations. Ultimately, that part of the Vladivostok proposals which applies to the PRC not only envisages the complete elimination of the negative accretions of Soviet-Chinese relations in the preceding period, but also makes it possible, on the basis of the experience and lessons of the past, to fully activate the tremendous potential of cooperation and good neighborliness.

Clear and highly promising prospects along this avenue are generated by the effect of objective factors: the common nature of the socioeconomic system; geographical proximity; identical priorities in strategic tasks aimed at accelerating socioeconomic development; self-improvement [samosovershenstvovaniye] of socialism; and the historically developed complementarity of the Soviet and Chinese economies.

The most important task at the present stage of the development of Soviet-Chinese relations is to ensure the continuity and dynamism of this process and to create the most favorable conditions for its qualitative development.

/The Soviet Union's efforts **in the political sphere** are aimed at further developing mutual understanding with China, raising the level of political contacts, and consolidating the legal treaty base of mutual relations./

We see no benefit in separating the sphere of political relations from specific ties in different spheres and, as M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in reply to questions from the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka*, we are in no way inclined to hold back the political dialogue.

In our view, necessary prerequisites do exist for positive progress in the sphere of political relations between the two countries and for narrowing the sphere of differences. The most important conditions for the materialization of these prerequisites are strict observance of the principles of equality and self-dependence [samostoyatelnost], respect for each other's sovereignty, mutual trust, and consideration for each side's national interests. These principles of interstate relations were formulated and introduced in political practice by the socialist countries, and therefore socialist states like the USSR and the PRC are fully capable of setting an example of their observance and further development for the whole world.

The Soviet Union is fully aware of the PRC's role as a great power pursuing a self-dependent [samostoyatelnyy] and independent [nezavisimyy] foreign policy aimed at strengthening peace all over the world. Our country invariably supported and continues to support China's efforts to defend and uphold its state sovereignty, including its just stance with regard to Taiwan as an integral part of the PRC.

Acclaiming the enhancement of China's constructive role in international affairs, the Soviet Union perceives it as a key factor of international and regional security. At present it is essentially impossible to find a just and lasting solution to international problems both on the Asian and the global scale without China, a great socialist power standing at the sources of the conception of the five principles of peaceful coexistence and possessing a widespread system of international ties and interests.

There is a gradually expanding sphere of coinciding USSR and PRC approaches to the fundamental theoretical problems of the building of socialism and international development. It would be no exaggeration to say that the greatest degree of proximity in the last 25 and even 30 years on many of these problems has been achieved at the present.

There is a growing similarity in the approaches of our two countries to the most important question of our time—the problem of war and peace. The necessity of peaceful international conditions, an active struggle for peace, and peaceful coexistence as the sole alternative for mankind's survival are perceived by both countries as decisive factors and conditions for national and worldwide development.

The USSR and the PRC are the two socialist nuclear powers which unilaterally made the decision not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Soon after the USSR announced a moratorium on nuclear tests, the PRC Government declared that it would refrain from nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere.

The Soviet Union and China actively support the process of creating regional zones free from nuclear weapons. They were the first nuclear powers to sign the treaty proclaiming the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone, concluded by the South Pacific Forum member countries (the Rarotonga Treaty). The USSR and the PRC advocate the strengthening of the nuclear-free status of the Treaty on Creating a Nuclear-Free Zone in Latin America (the Tlatelolco Treaty) and the plans to create a similar zone in the South Atlantic.

The two countries occupy similar positions on the impermissibility of the militarization of outer space and the settlement of acute regional conflicts and problems as in the Near East, southern Africa, and Central America. With respect to the situation in Asia and the Pacific, our countries occupy similar positions of a negative attitude toward processes of militarization of the region and attempts to gain some sort of monopoly there in determining the future and prospects of the region's development. At the same time, it is possible to note differences in the approaches of the USSR and the PRC toward an

important question like the cause of the arms race and tension in the world. China adheres to the viewpoint that responsibility for this lies with "the two superpowers." New, more realistic and more differentiated assessments of the foreign policy strategy of the Soviet Union and the other world powers have recently emerged in the PRC on this issue.

/In the sphere of **ensuring confidence-building measures**, it is well known that the Soviet Union, proceeding from the ideas of ensuring an all-embracing system of international security, has proposed and is implementing a whole package of interlinked measures at both bilateral and multilateral levels./

They are aimed at fundamentally improving the military-political situation in Asia and the Pacific, terminating the arms race there, organizing multilateral mutually advantageous cooperation in the economic, political, cultural, and humanitarian spheres and in the sphere of confidence-building measures regarding military-political aspects, and creating prerequisites for the political settlement of existing conflicts and seats of tension. Included are proposals to convene a future pan-Asian forum to examine security questions; the strengthening of confidence-building measures between states in the region; proposals to cut back naval activity in the waters of Asia, the Pacific, and other regions submitted as part of a special memorandum for examination by the second special UN General Assembly session on disarmament; and many others.

The new Soviet initiatives outlined by M.S. Gorbachev in his replies to questions from the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka* were of great importance for all countries in Asia and the whole world. The USSR's readiness to eliminate the 100 medium-range missile warheads in Asia, subject to similar actions by the United States, creates a real prospect for substantially changing the military-political situation in Asia and the Pacific and considerably raising the level of security for states situated there, including China. The Chinese leadership has on the whole positively perceived the new Soviet initiative.

As for confidence-building measures specifically in the sphere of bilateral Soviet-Chinese relations, the Soviet Union, attaching major importance to the radical reduction of armed forces and armaments in Asia, has proposed discussing with the PRC specific steps aimed at commensurate reductions of the level of both countries' ground forces. The achievement of such an accord between the two powers would not only be a substantial contribution to the cause of detente in the region and all over the world but would also set a wonderful example for other countries and would help ease tension in China's relations with India and the Indochina countries.

In his Vladivostok speech M.S. Gorbachev formulated a proposal that border lines should run along the main channel (or in the middle of rivers for nonnavigable rivers) of border rivers. The USSR-PRC border talks which resumed in February 1987 are proceeding in a businesslike atmosphere. They are highly important for both countries and help to improve the general atmosphere in bilateral ties.

In its desire to make a specific contribution to the cause of improving the situation in Asia and creating an atmosphere of trust in this vast region, the Soviet Government, following corresponding consultations with the governments of the Mongolian People's Republic and the DRA, decided to withdraw from Afghanistan six regiments from the composition of the limited contingent of Soviet troops temporarily stationed in that country and also announced a significant reduction of Soviet military personnel in Mongolia, and implemented this.

China perceives the so-called "Cambodia problem" as one of the main obstacles in the way of full normalization of USSR-PRC political relations. Our countries' approaches toward this problem differ substantially, but the main point is that they both advocate its political settlement. We believe that a real path toward such a settlement could be provided by the course of national reconciliation put forward by the PRK Government and the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops, as coordinated with Cambodia, by 1990. In our view, this course would not inflict any damage at all on China's interests and is in keeping with the long-term goals of creating a favorable situation of peace and stability along the PRC's southern borders.

/The **development of economic relations between our countries** contains enormous opportunities and reserves./

The Soviet Union respects the strategic goal put forward by the PRC leadership of modernizing the country and building in the long-term future a socialist society befitting a great people. The broad exchange of experience of socialist building emerging in the course of the implementation of large-scale economic reforms in both countries is capable of becoming an important factor for accelerating our development and saving time and human and material resources. The PRC is also following the progress of restructuring in our country with keen interest.

The present volume and depth of Soviet-Chinese economic relations is far below their inherent potential. In the conditions created by the effect of a favorable factor like the historically developed mutual complementarity of the Soviet and Chinese economies, the USSR's share in China's foreign trade was only 3.2 percent in 1985, against the 28 percent share held by Japan, 11.7 percent by the EEC countries, and 10.8 percent by the United States.

An important reserve for ensuring a breakthrough in this sector of cooperation lies in the broad retooling of industry, including Soviet organizations' involvement in the modernization of PRC industrial enterprises built in in the fifties with the Soviet Union's help. Under the July

1985 agreement the USSR will assist in the construction of 7 new enterprises and the reconstruction of 17 existing ones in the spheres of power engineering, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, machine building, and the coal and chemical industries, including major ones like the Anshan, Baotou, and Wuhan metallurgical combines, the Luoyang tractor plant, and others. For its part, the Soviet Union is interested in China's experience in the retooling of a broad range of light and food industry enterprises. This pledge places a major responsibility on the relevant Soviet departments and enterprises, since our participation in the modernization of Chinese industrial installations will be implemented in conditions of major competition by Western firms and organizations from other socialist countries and from China itself—conditions fundamentally different from the situation in the fifties.

Border trade, which is developing fast, is a promising new element in the system of trade and economic relations between the USSR and the PRC.

Major potential opportunities to further boost the pace of trade and economic cooperation are provided by the active quest for new forms of trade, economic, scientific, and technical ties, including joint companies and enterprises, the collective development of natural resources in the vast border regions, and transportation and infrastructure development. The restructuring of foreign economic activity under way in the USSR, coupled with the advantages of the policy of expanding foreign economic ties being implemented in China, could give a new fillip to cooperation in these spheres. In this context major importance is attached to the signing of the USSR-PRC agreement on cooperation between supreme planning organs signed during the September 1986 visit by N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the PRC.

The comprehensive development and rational utilization of the water resources of the Amur, Irtysh, Ili, and other border rivers constitute a problem of tremendous national economic and social importance for both countries, whose expansion [rasshireniye] is possible only given the closest possible collaboration. According to estimates by Chinese experts, five major and medium-size GES's could be built on the Amur River alone. This could also create future conditions for joint economic activity to develop natural resources in neighboring USSR and PRC regions.

Broad prospects for the development of cooperation will be offered by the commissioning of the railroad section linking the PRC's Xinjiang-Uygur Autonomous Region with Soviet Central Asia. Chinese experts note that in the future this track could become a "new Silk Road," the shortest transport connection linking China with countries in Europe and the Near East.

Of course, the development of economic ties between the USSR and China encounters certain difficulties. Essentially it could not be otherwise, bearing in mind the things that have built up between the two countries in the past. The effects of the insufficiently developed legal treaty base of long-term mutual relations, the lack of coordination in the planning of the two countries' economies, the certain narrowness of export opportunities, and so on, can still be felt. But even these difficulties are mainly difficulties of growth. They are perfectly surmountable and create no fundamental obstacles in the way of substantially developing USSR-PRC economic ties. Contacts in the sphere of science, culture, and sports and ties between public organizations are now an important component of Soviet-Chinese relations. There has been significant development of ties between the two countries' creative unions, exchanges of trade union delegations and delegations of social scientists and experts in the natural sciences, ties through friendship society channels, exchanges of students and lecturers between the Soviet Union and China, and contacts through other channels.

The Soviet Union acclaims the development of the PRC's relations with socialist community countries and advocates the swiftest normalization of relations with the Indochina countries.

We respect the path of socialist modernization chosen in the PRC, which envisages broad participation in international economic exchanges and development of contacts with Western countries. The Soviet Union does not link the prospects of improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations with simultaneous complication of China's relations with any other country or group of countries. We do, however, expect exactly the same attitude from our Chinese partners. In our belief, such a model of building relations is in line with the realities of today's world and the principles of the new political thinking.

The Soviet Union is not inclined to idealize the picture of Soviet-Chinese relations. Often enough it is quite variegated. We do not close our eyes to the different approaches and the differences existing between our countries, but the Soviet side does not perceive them as some fatal inevitability. Our path lies through constant quest for ways to overcome existing contradictions. The Soviet leadership has repeatedly stressed its readiness "to discuss with China at any time, at any level, and in the most serious fashion the questions of supplementary measures to create an atmosphere of good neighborliness."

The first major steps have been taken along the path of cooperation and good neighborliness which has been firmly taken by our countries. This is just the beginning of a long road. As M.S. Gorbachev noted, "thinking about the future, it can be said that there are enormous reserves of cooperation between the USSR and China. They are great because such cooperation corresponds with the interests of both countries; because the things which are most precious for our peoples—socialism and peace—are inseparable."

Northeast Asia

Nakasone: INF Agreement 'Step Forward'

LD211922 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 21 Sep 87

[Text] New York September 21 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone has welcomed the Soviet-American agreement in principle to eliminate intermediate-range missiles and hold a summit later in autumn.

Addressing the U.N. General Assembly session today, he stressed the need for establishing trust based on the total elimination of nuclear weapons and on peaceful coexistence.

The agreement in principle to conclude an INF treaty was history's first accord on the reduction of nuclear arms and a major step forward in that area, he emphasized.

"I hope that the U.S. and the USSR as a next step will swiftly and consistently implement the plan for considerable—50 per cent—cuts in strategic armaments, while preserving the balance of deterrence," Nakasone said.

Success of these efforts, Nakasone said, would bring the peoples of both countries closer to each other and evoke universal support.

Further progress could then be achieved in nuclear and conventional disarmament, chemical and other types of weapons, and in strengthening nuclear non-proliferation.

This, in turn, would bring about progress in handling regional problems and pave the way towards a universal peace.

Nakasone stressed the importance of genuine progress in nuclear disarmament and promised the international community the Japanese Government's full assistance in that effort.

U.S. Plans SDI Participants Conference

LD271642 Moscow TASS in English 1351 GMT 27 Sep 87

[Text] Tokyo September 27 TASS—The Pentagon is planning to hold in the USA early in November this year a conference of representatives of the governmental departments and business cirlces of Japan and of other western countries, whose governments declared their participation in the work to carry out the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative". Reporting on that, the newspaper *Nihon Keizai*, an influential publication of the Japanese financial-industrial circles, points out that the main cause which made the USA take up explanatory work among its SDI partners is the obvious decline of interest in it among the business circles of the allies of the United States.

In Japan itself some leading electrical engineering companies have openly declined to participate in the implementation of the Star Wars plans; others are apparently not in a hurry to share with the Pentagon their advanced developments in the field of electronics. As the journal *Shukan Asahi* pointed out in its recent publication, the cause behind the situation is that the U.S. military and industrial complex is obviously out to monopolize the achievements of modern science and technology by placing them at the service of their selfish interests.

MPR's Namsry Hails INF Agreement

OW260431 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2300 GMT 23 Sep 87

[Text] Mongolia appraises the achievement of an agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons as a an event of historical significance. This is what Tserendashiyn Namsray, member of the Politburo and secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, stated to our correspondent in Ulaanbaatar.

[Begin Namsray recording in Mongolian, fading into Russian translation] A very important step has been taken to bid farewell to weapons of mass destruction. Such agreement has struck a telling blow to the concept of limited use of nuclear weapons and the so-called controlled escalation of nuclear conflicts. It undermines skeptics' conclusions about the impossibility and utopianism of the program for eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000—weapons which constitute the main threat to our existence on this planet. As is known, this program, put forward by the Soviet Union, received wide world support. Its co-authors, the countries of the socialist community, including the MPR, actively spoke in favor of it. Finally, the Soviet-U.S. agreement on INF and operation-tactical missiles allows us to believe that the new political thinking—although happening slower than we would like—is increasingly having a positive influence on world development.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev correctly noted in his article "The Realities of Guarantees for a Secure World," in our contemporary reality, small blocks already exist from which we can begin to erect the future security system. Despite existing difficulties, mankind received one more real opportunity to hope that the structure of this security would indeed be erected. [end recording]

DPRK Conference Urges Korean Reunification

LD271239 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT 27 Sep 87

[Text] Pyongyang September 27 TASS—The participants in the international conference—for nuclear disarmament, peace, and anti-imperialist solidarity in the Asia-Pacific region—which ended here on Saturday, condemned U.S. interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people and demanded that the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons be withdrawn from the south of the Korean peninsula. They held a rally in the capital of the DPRK today to hail the efforts of the government and the people of the DPRK, aimed at the country's peaceful reunification.

A message to the population of South Korea was passed at the meeting expressing support for its struggle against the dominance of U.S. imperialism, for democratic reforms in the country.

The conference was attended by representatives of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, and the public of the Soviet Union, Cuba, India, Egypt, Japan and other countries.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Foreign Minister Addresses UNGA

LD282040 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan 'Abdol Wakil stated that the policy of national reconciliation in Afghanistan and the talks in Geneva with the participation of the representative of the U.N. secretary general are two seperate processes leading to a single aim—to achieve peace in the country and a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

Speaking today at the 42nd session of the United Nations General Assembly the head of the Afghan delegation said that the policy of national reconciliation, pursued by the DRA Government from January 15 of this year, is an expression of determination and new political thinking and of the common endeavour of every Afghan patriot towards putting an end to fratricide and the establishment of peace and tranquillity in the country. But it is exactly after the announcement of the programme for national reconciliation that the flow of modern weapons supplied to the opposition by their supporters from across the oceans has sharply increased, 'Abdol Wakil told the General Assembly. The USA has increased its financial aid for the continuation of the undeclared war from 530 million dollars in the last year to 630 million dollars in the current year, which shall reach 1,000 million dollars next year.

"Our people firmly believe that, with the full realization of the policy of national reconciliation, nation-wide peace will inevitably be ensured in the country," 'Abdol Wakil stressed. This policy fully accords with the principles of humanism, Islam, Afghan traditions, the United Nations Charter and the universal declaration of human rights, he said further.

The DRA minister of foreign affairs called on the Pakistani side to display political realism and take a constructive stand so as to resolve the remaining differences at the talks in Geneva between Afghanistan and Pakistan with the participation of the personal representative of the United Nations secretary general. The Afghan minister said that the sides had achieved progress at the talks since the time of the previous session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Afghan Delegate Speaks at Press Conference

LD260312 Moscow TASS in English 2230 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—"The April Revolution has dealt a blow at reaction in our region. Therefore reaction tries to erode the gains achieved by the revolutionary people in Afghanistan," said chairman of the Central Council of the National Fatherland Front of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, chairman of the Supreme Extraordinary Commission for National Reconciliation, head of the delegation of the National Fatherland Front of Afghanistan, Abdul Rahim Hatif. He spoke here today at a press conference of the delegation of the National Fatherland Front of Afghanistan which is on a visit in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

"There is not a single family in Afghanistan which has not been affected by military actions waged by bandits. I know families where eleven people were killed by bandits. Brothers spill the blood of brothers."

"The policy of national reconciliation must put an end to this bloodshed," the head of the Afghan delegation said. "This policy meets with support within the country and abroad. Refugees are returning home. The party and government help them settle down, give them jobs."

An agreement on cooperation between the National Fatherland Front of Afghanistan and the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee was signed at the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. The agreement emphasizes concern over the further aggravation of the situation in a number of areas, over the existence of global problems which pose threat to the future of humanity.

Najib Addresses Meeting of Hazara Tribes

PM250935 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Afghanistan: Jirgah Has Begun Work"]

[Text] Kabul, 21 Sep—The first all-Afghan jirgah of Hazaras has begun work in the DRA capital.

Almost 1,000 delegates are discussing questions connected with the participation of the Hazaras—one of the nationalities in Afghanistan—in the process of national reconciliation, and are resolving vital problems facing the Hazara tribes.

Najib, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, delivered a speech at the forum's opening. He stressed that the April Revolution ended arbitrariness and injustice. For the first time in Afghanistan's history the Hazara people occupied a worthy place in Afghan society. Najib stated the readiness of the Afghan authorities to review the existing borders of the Hazara provinces and bring them into line with the settlement of Hazaras which has emerged over the centuries, and he put forward concrete proposals designed to ensure genuine equal rights for them.

The exhausting, bloody war that has tormented the Afghan land for over 8 years is impeding the implementation of the humane plans. The forces opposing renewal in Afghanistan—internal counterrevolution, regional reaction, and international imperialism—unleashed it, the Afghan leader said. Today our enemies have one aim—to wreck the course of national reconciliation and to continue the senseless bloodshed by any means. But constructive labor and war are incompatible. That is why the PDPA has initiated and organized the only policy able to bring peace to the country—the policy of national reconciliation. Since 15 January, when we announced the unilateral cease-fire and other measures directed at reaching lasting peace in the country, 9 months have passed. They have brought many victories, the main one being the Afghan people's total approval and support for the course of national reconciliation, the general secretary stated. But, he noted, the enemy has not laid down his arms and his resistance has become fiercer and more embittered. Serious obstacles to peace have appeared which can only be overcome by the common efforts of all Afghanistan's peoples.

The attention of the world community, Najib continued, is today riveted on the article "Reality and the Guarantees of a Secure World" by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It clearly and consistently sets out the Soviet Union's peace-loving position, which accords with the interests of the planet's peoples, and puts forward constructive new proposals for setting up an all-embracing system of international security.

The Afghan people are well aware of how much the Soviet Union is doing for a political settlement to conflicts and the establishment of good-neighborliness and mutually advantageous cooperation with other countries, including the DRA. The Afghan people, who thirst for peace, wholly support the USSR's peace-loving course, Najib stressed.

Soltan Ali Keshtmand, member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers, also addressed the jirgah.

Afghan Commission on Plane Crash Concludes

LD251730 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] The commission of inquiry into the causes of the loss of the AN-26 passenger transport airplane has concluded its work in Kabul. Our correspondent Aleksandr (Shkirando) interviewed Major General Abdol Fatah, commander of the Air Force of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, chairman of the commission.

[Begin Fatah recording in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation] This tragic event occurred on 13 September. The AN-26 passenger transport plane was on a journey on the Kabul-Konduz route. There were nine people aboard the plane—three crew-members and six passengers. On the approach to the town of Konduz the plane was shot down. All the passengers who were in the plane, together with the crew, died. It should be noted that this is not the first occasion that Afghan counterrevolutionaries, having received Blowpipe and Stinger missiles from imperialist countries—primarly England and the United States—have shot down our transport airplanes. It was this year that in the Khost region a Stinger missile shot down a transport plane. Aboard it were many civilian passengers, among whom were women and children. Two other airplanes were shot down in the Kandahar area. One of these, which belonged to Bakhtar Afghan Airlines was shot down as it took off over the airport; the other transport plane fell victim to air terrorists on the Kandahar-Kabul route. In the course of this year alone over 250 people have died. Regarding the AN-26 airplane shot down near Konduz, our commission has quite precisely determined that the plane was shot down by two U.S. Stinger missiles. Both missiles landed in the engines. In the wreckage of the aircraft we discovered also an unexploded part of a missile, on which can clearly be seen the brand name of the rocket and its place of origin. [end recording]

Kornilov Views DRA-Pakistan Situation

PM231101 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 19 Sep 87 p 3

[Political observer Yuriy Kornilov "View Of Events": "Kabul's Peace Efforts"]

[Text] The undeclared war against democratic Afghanistan has been going on for 8 years, and for 5 years there has been a dialogue between Kabul and Islamabad on the settlement of the "Afghan problem." The latest round of the indirect talks, which are conducted via the UN secretary general's personal representative, has just ended in Geneva. Observers note that although it has been possible in the course of the talks to agree in the main on many important elements of a comprehensive agreement of the Afghan situation, the Geneva dialogue has been extremely difficult and slow, with interruption after interruption. On this occasion the sides were unable to reach agreement on the schedule for the return of Soviet troops to the homeland following the signing of an agreement. As usual, Washington entirely blames the DRA and the USSR for the lack of progress. But what, or rather who, is actually preventing a settlement?

Of course, the answer to the question must be sought not in Geneva, but in the capitals where the sides' positions are determined. An analysis of these positions readily shows that what we have is two different, in fact, diametrically opposite approaches to the problem.

On the one hand, the clear, purposeful line of the Afghan leadership, which has been formulated with the utmost clarity: Halt the fratricidal bloodshed and achieve national reconciliation! The conduct of this responsible and farsighted policy which places on the agenda, along with the establishment of peace, the solution of tasks for Afghanistan's present and future such as ensuring fair representation for the entire people in the political

structure and the country's economic life and preserving and augmenting its historical, national, and cultural traditions requires of Kabul determination, courage, and a genuinely constructive approach. But today no one, including sovereign Afghanistan's enemies, can dispute the obvious fact that the course of ensuring internal peace is already bearing substantial fruit. This year alone over 83,000 Afghan refugees have returned home and 25,000 former bandits have discontinued their armed struggle and joined the ranks of the supporters of reconciliation. The PDPA put forward the idea of creating a coalition government, proposing a division of power among all the forces who support or are willing to support an end to the bloodshed and a peaceful, independent, nonaligned Afghanistan. The government's unilateral cease-fire has been extended until 15 January 1988. A law has been adopted authorizing the activity of political parties. A draft new constitution for the country has been submitted for nationwide discussion.

Kabul's line of national reconciliation and the policy of peace and national concord are democratic Afghanistan's appeal to its neighbors, a call for direct and honest talks, for the normalization of relations in accordance with the principles of mutual respect, sovereignty, goodneighborliness, and noninterference in one another's affairs. On more than one occasion the DRA Government has publicly stated that by agreement with the USSR the Soviet troops in Afghanistan will be returned home as quickly as possible once imperialist outside interference ends and guarantees are given that it will not be resumed. All this convincingly confirms that independent Afghanistan is determined that the hotbed of regional conflict in Asia should be extinguished and that the long-awaited peace should finally triumph in the tormented land of Afghanistan.

The Pakistani leaders have also said a great deal about wanting a settlement to the Afghan situation. "The speediest political solution of this problem is of undoubted importance," Pakistani Prime Minister M.K. Junejo told me a few months ago in Islamabad. The country's foreign minister, Yaqub Khan, spoke in the same vein on Pakistani television the other day.

A positive approach, one might think, but what is its practical manifestation? I put the question during a newspaper assignment in Pakistan to the eminent Pakistani publicist M.B. Nakvi [name as published]. Here is his reply: "We in Pakistan have learned more than once from our own difficult political experience that a regime's policy should be judged not by the words and statements of its representatives, but by their actual deeds. If you assess the situation from this viewpoint, you have to admit that today, as yesterday, Pakistan is conducting a proimperialist, militarist course and that it is one of the main U.S. political and strategic military bridgeheads in Asia, if you like, a kind of "South Asian Israel," with whose assistance Washington is seeking to safeguard its own positions and interests in the region. Of course, such important political "services" must be paid for, and the remuneration is lavish: U.S. economic and military "aid" to Pakistan has now almost reached the massive sum of $8 billion. The piper calls the tune: In return for the "aid," our country's ruling circles are effectively supporting Washington's course of continuing the undeclared war against sovereign Afghanistan and are preventing a political settlement of the Afghan problem..."

The actual situation is that the war in Afghanistan is essentially a U.S. war which Washington is waging with the aid of its allies and voluntary accomplices. The characteristic thing is that as the Asian and international public's advocacy of a settlement of the Afghan situation becomes more vigorous, as more positive moves are made at the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva, and as instances of concerted efforts by representatives of different strata of the Afghan public who actually want to establish peace in their native land become more obvious, the resistance of forces who are patently not interested in extinguishing the conflict becomes more active and more sophisticated. The U.S. Administration has already spent more than $2 billion on "aid" for counterrevolutionary Afghan formations. It is apparent from reports in the U.S. press that the figure will increase by a further $700 million this year. Now that the Afghan government is calling for a cease-fire the flow of weapons "Made in the USA" headed for the dushman headquarters is not only increasing, but changing qualitatively: The CIA-trained bandits are being supplied with, in particular, up-to-date Stinger antiaircraft missiles which they are using to shoot down civil aircraft.

All this is the Washington-devised policy of neoglobalism in action, a policy whose traces can easily be detected not only in Asia, but on other continents. Of course, every regional conflict has its own roots, its own "medical history," so to speak, and specific treatment is needed. But these conflicts also have something in common: They are based, as a rule, on the actions of imperialist forces which regard with imperial scorn the desires and needs of the liberated states, do not want to accept the irreversible changes taking place in the world, and are trying to conduct the old hegemonist, essentially colonialist course, newly packaged. It is a fact that were it not for U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, and other states, were it not for Washington's subversive actions against legitimate governments, affairs in these countries would follow a different path.

"The essential condition of general security is total observance of the UN Charter and the right of the peoples to independently choose the direction and forms of their development, revolutionary or evolutionary," M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his article entitled "The Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World." "This also applies to the right to a social status quo. Also an entirely internal affair. All efforts — direct and indirect — to influence the development of countries other than one's own and interfere in them must be ruled out. Efforts to destabilize existing governments from outside are also inadmissible."

Certain circles in the United States today, as in the past, are counting on exporting counterrevolution and are stubbornly refusing to relinquish the doctrine of "neo-globalism," which allegedly gives them the right to establish in sovereign states a system that suits and benefits Washington. The architects of this policy and their accomplices also bear full responsibility for the continuing bloodshed in Afghanistan. As for our country, which firmly supports the Afghan leadership's line of national reconciliation and peace, it is convinced that given the political will and a really constructive approach, the question of a settlement of the Afghan situation can be solved. The quicker it is done the better it will be for the interests of peace and security in the region and in the world as a whole.

U.S. Interference in India Criticized

BK171715 Moscow in Hindi to India 1400 GMT 16 Sep 87

[Oleg Ivanov commentary]

[Text] Lately, the Indian press has been writing a great deal about the sinister activities of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Some time ago, the weekly *Blitz* published details of the CIA's direct interference in the internal affairs of India. The *Blitz* published a letter from the former CIA chief, the late William Casey, to the American Heritage Foundation revealing Washington's plans to overthrow the present Indian Government. The Indian parliament held a discussion on the issue in light of the facts published in the weekly and described it as a widespread conspiracy to destabilize the country. It was only natural for CIA authorities to contradict Casey's letter. But their denial did not silence the Indian people. Another newspaper, *The Tribune*, wrote that the CIA's denials cannot be relied on since it is difficult to believe in the innocence of the CIA, which has been caught red-handed in India on a number of occasions and has had many of its special activities exposed. The long list of CIA activities compels one to think seriously and to draw general conclusions.

In a recent article published in *Patriot*, a prominent political commentator, Mohit Sen, made an interesting observation by linking the publication of Casey's letter and the beginning of the Bofors gun deal issue, as he had reached the conclusion that these two incidents occurred at the same time. There is nothing surprising in this because the foreign reactionary forces do not like India's policy of nonalignment and struggle for peace. A similar accusation has also been made in regard to Sweden, which, as is known, actively cooperates with India under the framework of the Delhi Six group of nations. Mohit Sen added that the Bofors issue strikes simultaneously at two countries that are disliked by international reactionaries. Is it a matter of sheer chance?

One more thing is noteworthy. While investigating the Bofors issue, the Indian Government will hardly be able to pay due attention to current national political problems, especially the problem of resisting efforts designed to undermine the integrity of India. Such problems are numerous and emerge in a more violent form in Punjab. Lately, the secessionists in Punjab have been raising their heads on a large scale. They demand the separation of Punjab from India and establishment of the so-called Khalistan state. In the past 3 months alone, more than 600 people were killed by extremists. President's rule has been imposed in Punjab.

As is known, the terrorists are enjoying the support of certain quarters in the United States. The CIA provides direct assistance to them through the Heritage Foundation and the arms they use in carrying out acts of terrorism may be supplied through Afghan counterrevolutionaries. The CIA's Afghan stooges cannot, probably, do this without being asked to.

The CIA's dark activities can be seen in many tense regions of the Indian subcontinent. For example, some observers think the activities of the antigovernment forces in Assam and neighboring areas are also linked with the actions of this agency.

Only recently, a conspiracy to assassinate Rajiv Gandhi was exposed. In line with this, the issue relating to the so-called case of bird watching in the mid 1980's is worth mentioning. We would like to give a brief description of that case in which a group of CIA agents in the guise of ornithologists entered Meghalaya where they not only established an observation center with powerful radar, but also tried to coordinate the activities of the local separatist elements. Then, these agents were expelled from India.

But who can say that was the last attempt? When analyzing such plans, a statement by the former deputy director of the CIA, Gates, comes to mind. In that statement, he said that when U.S. diplomacy or its naked military intervention fails to achieve the desired chain of events, another technique is employed; that technique is the covert operation.

India's situation proves the veracity of this statement. After the assassination of Mrs Indira Gandhi, certain Western quarters expected the new prime minister, Rajiv Gandhi, to institute radical changes in the country's foreign policy. But those hopes were shattered. India continues to enjoy, as before, a prestigious position in the international arena and is pursuing a policy of preserving the peace and security of nations, and of safeguarding the interests of developing nations. There has been no abatement in the active role India holds in international forums, such as the United Nations and the Nonaligned Movement. The greatest cause of dissatisfaction in certain Western quarters is, perhaps, the policy being pursued by India of developing friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The approach of India and the socialist countries to basic issues concerning humankind — nuclear disarmament, establishment of a reliable global security system, and a new international economic order — is the basis for their nearly identical positions.

Under these circumstances, the ongoing anti-India propaganda campaign and the direct interference of foreign powers are obviously designed to undermine, in any way possible, India's unity, to force it to bow before the West, and to pressure it to forsake its independent foreign policy.

Commentary Views Israel's 'Nuclear Option'

TA251904 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1630 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Israel currently has at least 30 nuclear charges. This was stated by Egyptian Defense Minister General Abu Ghazala in an interview with the newspaper *Sawt al-Arab*. He emphasized that Israel's nuclear option poses a real danger to all the Arab countries. At the same time, the Kuwaiti newspaper *Al-Qabas* wrote that certain countries in the Middle East and in neighboring regions currently want to acquire nuclear technology, citing the need to protect themselves against the danger of an Israeli use of nuclear weapons as their reason.

As may be recalled, there have recently been numerous reports about Israel's nuclear potential. Now we are witnessing the results vis-a-vis the Middle East, and it does not at all matter whether or not this or that report about a bomb in the basement is true. The neighboring countries regard Israel's nuclear option as a threat to their existence and have already begun to take countermeasures. The Middle East has come very close to the red line beyond which they would enter the nuclear arms race.

Could Israel's leaders have predicted such a development? Undoubtedly, yes. As far back as the early 1960's, when Israel's nuclear option was still in its infancy, some high-level personalities warned about its negative consequences. For example, Yig'al Allon believed that nuclear weapons in the Israeli-Arab arena would be a hindrance to Israel even if it were the only country to possess them and, what is more, he did not think this would be very likely. The Israel Defense Force's [IDF] General Staff also subscribed to this view, albeit for different reasons. The officers warned that the cost of developing nuclear weapons would undermine the defense budget and adversely affect Israel's ability to defend itself. It was the General Staff that coined slogans such as: Not even one cent for missiles [af mil letil].

The government, nevertheless, was not prepared to take their opinion into consideration, and it continues to ignore this opinion to this very day. Why is that so? The reason may be gleaned from the words of the father of the U.S. nuclear strategy, Eugene Rostow: Nuclear weapons, he said, is first and foremost a political tool that is not produced to be used in the heat of the battle but to create political constrictions. This U.S. model of gambling on the power of the atom in the political game of poker has been embraced by the decisionmaking level in Israel. Jerusalem would first and foremost like to use the bomb in order to exert political pressures on the Arabs in a bid to perpetuate the occupation. Moshe Dayan, one of the most senior advocates of the nuclear option in Israel, said the purpose here is to create a stable balance of terror. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that this balance has not yet been cemented or at least, it is not so stable.

Wars break out in the Middle East with frightful frequency. For instance, the 1973 war broke out despite the fact that the Arabs took into consideration the danger that Israel might use nuclear weapons. Therefore, these dangers have not yet been removed, but new ones have been added. The Rostow formula proved untrue also as far as the global confrontation between the East and the West is concerned. Most scientists, even those in the United States, believe that the balance of nuclear terror is increasingly turning into a balance of death, into a cosmic nuclear catastrophe. If that is the case regarding the superpowers, which due to their special role in the world are always forced to take the deterrent factor of global responsibility into consideration, it is all the more so when it comes to regional disputes in general and the dispute in the Middle East in particular.

Forty years of hostility and mistrust have exacerbated the situation in this region to the point that the threat of a flare-up, of the outbreak of a big war because of any minor confrontation or even because of an accident always exists here. And, a war here — and this has been largely proved by the wars in both Lebanon and the Persian Gulf — has a dynamics of its own, which includes massive strikes on civilian targets and the use of nonconventional weapons.

Let us assume for a moment that an additional aspect of instability, the nuclear aspect, is added to all this. The Israeli nuclear challenge has already made certain countries in the region try to attain their own nuclear or chemical weapons. The British *Jane's Defense Weekly* has disclosed that all the confrontation states in the Middle East, excluding Lebanon, currently have chemical weapons. As a result, tension in the region has stepped up, suspiciousness has risen, and the danger of an outbreak of a new war has also increased. If such a war does break out, it will be Israel that will face the biggest danger because of its relatively small dimensions and the dense concentration of its population.

Soviet Delegation Completes Algerian Visit

PM290955 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Algiers, 26 Sep—The visit to Algeria by the Soviet Government delegation headed by K.F. Katushev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, has ended. The delegation had talks with an Algerian government delegation headed by A. Khellef, Algerian minister of finance. There was a discussion of questions of economic, technical, and trade

cooperation. As a result of the talks accords were reached on the further development and expansion of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Algeria. An important step was taken in implementing the long-term program of cooperation elaborated during the talks in Moscow in March 1986 between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and C. Bendjedid, general secretary of the National Liberation Front Party Central Committee and president of Algeria.

The Soviet Government delegation also had meetings with Algerian Prime Minister A. Brahimi; Minister of Heavy Industry F. Boudraa; Minister of Light Industry Z. Messaoudi; Minister of Energy and the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry B. Nabi; and M. Aberkan [name as published], deputy minister for cooperation at the foreign ministry. The meetings and talks took place in a friendly and constructive atmosphere. As a result of the talks a number of specific agreements were signed which specified deliveries of Algerian goods to the Soviet market and the Soviet side's participation in the installation of a number of establishments in Algeria.

The Soviet Government delegation left for home today.

Meetings, Discussions Mark YAR Celebration

Yemeni Envoy's Address

PM280951 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] The people of North Yemen advocate the development and strengthening of friendly relations and mutually advantageous cooperation with the Soviet Union. This was declared by 'A.'U. Muhammad, ambassador of the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] to the USSR, at a press conference in Moscow on 24 September. The press conference was devoted to the North Yemeni people's national holiday—the 25th anniversary of the September Revolution. The ambassador noted that the victory of the revolution paved the way to independent development for the country's people. During the past years the YAR has achieved remarkable successes in various spheres of life and the development of democracy. The Soviet Union's assistance and support are highly significant in the building of the new life.

'A.'U. Muhammad emphasized that the YAR supports the Soviet Union's peace initiatives aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons, terminating the arms race, and affirming new thinking in relations among states.

Lizichev Leaves for YAR

PM281001 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Sep 87 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Celebrations in the Yemen Arab Republic"]

[Text] A Soviet military delegation led by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, left for Sanaa 24 September at the invitation of the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] Armed Forces leadership. It will be taking part in celebrations dedicated to the 25th anniversary of the 1962 revolution.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Colonel General D.A. Volkogonov, deputy chief Soviet Army and Navy of the Main Political Directorate; and other generals and officers in the Soviet Armed Forces.

Those present also included 'Abd al-'Uthman Muhammad, YAR ambassador to the USSR, and Ahmad 'Abdallah 'Abd al-Ilah, ambassador for the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to the USSR.

Tatliyev Heads Visit

LD251106 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Excerpts] Sanaa, 25 Sep (TASS)—A Soviet delegation has arrived in the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] capital to take part in celebrations to mark the 25th anniversary of the September Revolution. The delegation is headed by Suleyman Tatliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The delegation is comprised of Yevgeniy Osadchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and Vladimir Polyakov, chief of the Near East and North Africa department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. [passage omitted]

The delegation was met by YAR Vice President A.K. al-'Arashi, Deputy Prime Minister H.M. Makki, and other officials. Among the welcoming party was Veniamin Popov, USSR ambassador to the YAR.

Discussions With 'Arafat

LD272222 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2011 GMT 27 Sep 87

[Text] Sanaa, 27 Sep (TASS)—The Soviet official delegation headed by S.B. Tatliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is here to attend the events held on occasion of the 25th anniversary of the North Yemen Revolution, met today with Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. In the course of the conversation which passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, issues associated with the prospects for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the dangerous developments in the Persian Gulf were discussed. The Palestinian leader expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union for the latter's consistent support of the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine.

Taking part in the conversation was V.V. Popov, ambassador of the USSR in the YAR. On the same day, members of the delegation were present at the ceremony of graduation of cadets of the Air Force and Air Defense college, Police and Infantry schools, as well as of the Navy and Army colleges.

Delegation Departs

LD281214 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0822 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Sanaa, 28 Sep (TASS)—A Soviet delegation led by S.B. Tatliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left here today. The delegation, which also included Ye. Osadchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and V.P. Polyakov, head of the Near Eastern and North African Countries Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, visited the YAR for the celebrations of the 25th anniversary of the anti-monarchy revolution.

In a statement to the press made prior to the departure from Sanaa, S.B. Tatliyev expressed thanks for the warm welcome received by the Soviet delegation. In conversations with the YAR leadership, we discussed ways of further developing cooperation between the USSR and the YAR for the benefit of both our countries, he said. The head of the Soviet delegation noted the great achievements made by the friendly YAR people in socioeconomic development and wished them further successes along that road.

At the airport, the delegation was seen off by YAR Vice President A.K. al-'Arashi. The send off party included V.V. Popov, USSR ambassador to the YAR.

East Europe

Romanian Parliamentarians Visit Moscow

Arrive 27 Sep

LD271327 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 27 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—A delegation of the Grand National Assembly of Romania arrived in Moscow today on an official friendly visit.

It is led by Ioan Anton, a member of the State Council of Romania.

The delegation was invited by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Meet Gromyko 28 Sep

LD282329 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1901 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TASS)—Today A.A. Gromyko received in the Kremlin a delegation of the Romanian Grand National Assembly, headed by Ioan Anton, Romanian State Council member and vice-president of the Romanian Academy of Sciences.

A friendly conversation took place during which the sides exchanged opinions on expanding and developing bilateral relations, and also about certain problems relating to the current international situation.

I. Anton talked about the main directions taken by the Romanian Grand National Assembly on implementing decisions made at the 13th RCP Congress on the plan for the country's socioeconomic development, and on progress in Romanian-Soviet cooperation in the most diverse fields.

A.A. Gromyko gave an account of the progress of restructuring of Soviet society, about how the decisions made at January and June Plena of the CPSU Central Committee are being fulfilled, and on the contribution of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the local state bodies in their implementation. It was stressed that on the threshold of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the organic link between the accomplishments of the Great October and the present revolutionary reforms is being realized with particular force.

"Ideas about life change," A.A. Gromyko said. "What was once suitable is no longer suitable. We are implementing radical reforms, but we are doing this rationally after careful consideration. It is not a case of doing things in a big way, striking out, without knowing where they will lead. We have an exact and deliberate goal. We want to use more fully the colossal potential of our socialist society.

"Soviet people are looking to the future with optimism and confidence. They have already proved more than once that they are capable of achieving the goals set.

"On the eve of the great anniversary of socialism, there is something to show for it. Our people are sure they are on the right road, that the tasks for developing the economy, resolving social problems, and improving socialist democracy will be fulfilled."

The sides expressed satisfaction with the development of Soviet-Romanian relations. They noted the great significance of the official, friendly visit which took place in May by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Romania, and the accords reached during his talks with Romanian President N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party central committee, for strengthening bilateral links and cooperation between the two fraternal socialist states.

"The Soviet Union occupies 34 percent of the overall volume of Romania's foreign trade, and our country is in eighth place in trade turnover amongst the USSR'S trading partners," I. Anton stated. "But this is not the limit. We will endeavor to continue developing Soviet-Romanian trade links."

When international problems were discussed, the main emphasis was placed on the struggle to prevent the nuclear threat and to strengthen universal security in Europe and the world, to halt the arms race, and on disarmament. The attainment of the Soviet-U.S. accords to eliminate the medium- and shorter-range missiles has, in the view of the sides, become a major international event. This accord makes it possible to achieve a breakthrough in the efforts of many years, directed at strengthening peace. The Romanian side welcomes this accord

and regards it as an event of historical importance. Both sides noted the role played by parliamentarians in the strengthening friendship and trust between peoples. Mutual desire to expand and deepen contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Romanian Grand National Assembly, between the standing commissions of the highest legislative bodies of both countries, was confirmed.

The talk was held in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding.

Taking part in the talk were, on the Soviet side: L.N. Tolkunov and A.E. Voss, chairmen of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Y.N. Balandin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee; N.F. Rubtsov, head of the Secretariat of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and B.I. Poklad, in charge of the section of Socialist Countries of South-East Europe of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and on the Romanian side by Aurel Ioncica, Romanian charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR.

LCY CC Plenary Meeting Held in Belgrade

LD260602 Moscow TASS in English 2334 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] Belgrade September 25 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Yugoslav League of Communists (LCY) held here examined the pressing tasks of communists in their efforts to strengthen legality. The key report was delivered by Milan Pancevski, member of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee.

The drive for observing the constitution and other legislative acts, the plenary meeting pointed out, is one of the main directions on the road of overcoming difficulties hampering the country's development. The obtaining situation in the sphere of legality, which has turned into a serious problem, interferes with the solution of tasks of stabilizing the economy, helps anti-socialist and other hostile forces to raise their heads, has unfavorable influence on the sentiments of the masses, social and political processes in society and, therefore, requires active and immediate actions of the League of Communists.

The plenary meeting pointed out that the main emphasis in the party's work to rectify the situation should be centered on combatting economic crime, mismanagement, callous attitude to applications and requests of working people.

The plenary meeting examined the question of improving the legal system of the country, raising the role of legality in the system of socialist self-government and discussed the fact that principles of legality became the most important element of self-government, conscientious discipline, law and order in society.

SFRY Airlines Head Meets Silayev

LD281644 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1033 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TANJUG)—Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today received Miljenko Zrelec, director general of Yugoslav Airlines (JAT). At this time talks were conducted concerning ways of improving Yugoslav-Soviet air links.

JAT's director general is in Moscow for talks with Aeroflot Director General V. Nazarov. Zrelec also had talks with V. Popov, chairman of the State Committee for Tourism.

Briefs

Agreement with Bulgaria

The USSR Ministry of Light Industry has signed an agreement on setting up a Bulgarian-Soviet organization called (?Elektoantsev). On the Bulgarian side it was signed by the Association of Goods for Man. It is the latest stage of 7 years of joint work, which has led to new technology in the cloth industry, using microprocessors and robut-run complexes. [Summary] *[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Sep 87 LD]*

West Europe

Gorbachev Meets French Delegation 29 Sep

LD291325 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] The general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, had a meeting in the Kremlin today with a large delegation of the French public that arrived in the USSR within the framework of "Initiative 87".

During the meeting, political leaders, journalists, and clergymen spoke of the tremendous interest in France in the restructuring underway in the USSR. They were of a high opinion of the recent Soviet-American accord on medium- and shorter-range missiles and noted the personal contribution made by the Soviet leader.

In his address to the delegation, Mikhail Gorbachev called "Initiative 87" a fine example of the public's growing role in solving important international problems. Among them, he singled out disarmament as the top priority. It is possible to resolve the issue only on the basis of equal security. Any attempt to attain military superiority, Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized, is dangerous because it produces concern of the other side, spreads distrust, and leads to instability.

He recalled the Soviet proposal on eliminating all nuclear weapons on earth till [as heard] the end of the century and said the Soviet Union is also ready to conduct talks on a stage-by-stage reduction of chemical and other weapons and also on reducing numerical

strength of the troops. The Soviet leader pointed out that it is necessary to approach the new realities of the nuclear age not from old positions, but to demonstrate a new thinking.

It is necessary to realize that all people are tired of confrontation, of the burden of militarization.

When describing the restructuring going on, Mikhail Gorbachev said that life itself has prompted the country to begin the process. This was not something that had dawned on a group of persons. The most resolute supporters of restructuring were the people. And it is the people's interest in the process that is a guarantee of success, said Mikhail Gorbachev.

AFP Report

AU291100 Paris AFP in English 1059 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met a French delegation for more than two hours at the Kremlin on Tuesday, appearing in public for the first time since August 7.

A correspondent for *Agence France-Presse* who was present reported that the Soviet leader appeared to be in fine health and made humorous remarks about rumors that his absence from public view was due to illness during his summer holiday.

But Mr Gorbachev did not explain his absence, which had raised speculation in the Western press.

Mr Gorbachev was slightly sun-tanned but also appeared to have lost some weight, and his face showed signs of fatigue.

He said he took the holiday he had "earned" from August 24 to September 24.

Mr. Gorbachev went on for an hour, speaking rapidly to members of the French friendship delegation which had come to Moscow.

He had particularly harsh words for what he called the "bourgeois French press, so-called free and independent."

Preview of Meeting

AU281406 Paris AFP in English 1404 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 28 (AFP)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev will receive a French delegation here Tuesday, an official source said Monday, ending 53 days of absence which fueled a wealth of speculation in the West.

Mr Gorbachev is officially still on holiday in the south of the country and is in "excellent health."

Rumors have been rife, however, about Mr. Gorbachev, whose departure on holiday was not officially announced here.

The West German daily newspaper *Bild* said he was suffering from a bad case of food poisoning while the Swedish newspaper Expressen put his absence down to the fact that his wife Raissa had undergone an appendectomy, which had been followed by complications.

The last public meeting attended by Mr Gorbachev was on August 7 when he met a group of U.S. Russian professors at the Kremlin. Since then the only sign of life has been his signature on an article in the official Pravda newspaper and on several messages.

Among the French delegation to be received by Mr Gorbachev Tuesday will be former French premier Pierre Mauroy, the official source said.

Mr Mauroy is one of a group of 370 French people due to arrive here Monday on a tour organized by the French-Soviet association.

French Arms Stance 'Rebuke' of Moscow

PM281535 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 87 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov dispatch: "Just Who Is in Thrall to Illusions? On France's Reaction to the Soviet-U.S. Accords on Medium-range and Operational-tactical Missiles"]

[Text] Paris—This is not the first time the Soviet-U.S. dialogue on questions of disarmament, particularly if it proceeds successfully, has made official Paris despondent. Starting with Reykjavik, the Parisian Cassandras have been predicting an unenviable fate for West Europe in the event of a Soviet-U.S. agreement being reached to eliminate medium- and short-range missiles. Contrary to the facts, they rebuke Moscow for steadfastly wishing, ever since the times of Peter I, to "swallow up" Europe, and Washington for its reluctance to defend it.

Now that the Soviet-U.S. talks on 18 September have been successfully completed and Washington has reported that the way is open for signing an agreement on eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, the French Government has remained true to its "tradition." Speaking in Bordeaux, Prime Minister J. Chirac declared: "Let us not give way to illusions and think that an important step has been taken on the way to ensuring security. It is important for the great arsenals (that is, the Soviet and U.S. strategic missiles—B.V.) to be reduced and for disarmament to be global, including conventional weapons."

Of course, no one would dispute the fact that global and complete disarmament is better than partial disarmament. Any sober-minded person understands that the reduction and elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles is an important initial step toward the goal, toward ensuring security not only for Europe but also for all mankind. It is no coincidence that few people in France have ventured openly to support the government's skepticism. Only ultras such as Le Pen,

leader of the "National Front," have been able to see the prospect of eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range and operational-tactical missiles with nuclear warheads in Europe and Asia as "the Russians' devilish plan" aimed at "swallowing up Europe." Only the right-wing *Le Figaro* called the agreement being prepared on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. missiles "dangerous."

A special statement supporting it has been issued by the General Labor Confederation—the largest trade union association—the French peace movement, and a number of other public organizations. G. Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party, declared the accords reached in Washington are an historic event because it is the first time the two leading nuclear powers have decided to reverse the process of building up their arsenals and to embark on the destruction of nuclear weapons. On the eve of his trip to Moscow, L. Jospin, first secretary of the Socialist Party, sharply criticized the stand taken by the government.

On 23 September *Le Monde* carried an article by former President V. Giscard d'Estaing. "The Soviet-U.S. agreement in principle on the destruction of medium-range missiles," he wrote, "is a good agreement which gives Europe a chance. In addition, medium-range missiles will be destroyed both in Europe and in Asia, and it is also good that the sides have rejected keeping some of these missiles to launch conventional weapons." Entering into polemics with *Le Figaro*, the former president writes: "One newspaper called it a 'dangerous agreement.' I think just the opposite, that this agreement, which Europeans were not involved in discussing, chiefly through their own fault, gives them an opportunity to bring both Europe's present interests and the West's strategy into line with reality."

The Chirac government has now set about convincing not only its own European allies but also the entire world community that it is right. The speech French Foreign Minister J.B. Raimond made at the current UN General Assembly session is very significant in this respect. The minister explained that, in the opinion of official Paris, the accord on eliminating U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles does not mean an automatic increase in security, as this is prevented by the supposedly existing "imbalance" in the sphere of conventional and chemical weapons between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. He declared that France will not participate in any multilateral talks on nuclear disarmament as long as this imbalance exists.

This categorical stance would be understandable if France itself were taking an active part in the disarmament talks and trying to involve other sides in them and, disillusioned with its attempts, had decided to wait for others to change their minds. But no, nothing like that is happening. Objectively, France itself is now hindering the holding of such talks because it has embarked on the path of an active arms buildup and is trying to draw its allies into this. It is no secret that the number of France's nuclear warheads will more than quadruple before the end of this century. It has already developed production of chemical and neutron weapons, and medium-range and operational-tactical missiles with nuclear warheads will be added to the arsenal. The current joint Franco-West German maneuvers are a kind of prologue to the creation of a united armed force of France and the FRG, and it is planned to make the French nuclear "deterrent force" its backbone.

Why has France conceived the intention of building up its military muscles right now, and why does it advocate continuing the arms race in Europe? It would have been very difficult to choose a less suitable historical time for this than now, when, to use V. Giscard d'Estaing's words, Europe really "has a chance"— a chance to become a continent of peace. It is hard to understand the champions of the policy of French "superarmament." Of course, it would be primitive to reduce everything simply to the desire of the very influential French military-industrial complex to continue getting rich out of the arms race. This desire is evident and must not be disregarded. France's military-strategic doctrine—the concepts of "omnidirectional defense" and "nuclear deterrence"—is founded not only on the interests of monopolies but also on numerous fears and prejudices originating not in the nuclear age but in the last century. The creators of these concepts decided to insure themselves against all eventualities of life, as it were. They saw nuclear weapons not only as a means of preserving France's greatness and its status as a great power but also as the only guarantee against any possible aggression.

For a long time the Soviet Union figured as the "potential enemy" in France's official military doctrine. Now it is not named directly. In the opinion of those who shape France's military-strategic thinking, any country could find itself among the "potential aggressors."

Naturally, such "nuclear stereotypes" prevent the French ruling circles from understanding that in the modern world each person's security has become inseparable from the security of all and that, because of this, in our age nuclear weapons can no longer increase anyone's security. Scientists have estimated, for example, that the destruction of nuclear power stations on French territory, even without nuclear war, will result in the devastation of all of Europe. These stereotypes prevent France from giving up the illusions of "nuclear thinking" and getting actively involved in the disarmament talks process. Obviously, it is a matter of time, but time is pressing. In France, by all accounts, it is not only Communists and other left-wing forces who understand that it is time to get out of the nuclear impasse and move together with all mankind toward a world without nuclear weapons and without wars.

Seminar Urges EEC Defense Cooperation

PM251439 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "For the Expansion of Military Cooperation"]

[Text] Paris, 22 Sep—*Le Monde* reports that Paris could soon offer its West European partners an opportunity to

get involved in implementing a joint program of scientific research in the military sphere—a militarist version of the "Eureka" project. This question was the focus of attention at the scientific seminar on "National Defense and International Cooperation" held recently in Montpellier under the auspices of the General Secretariat of National Defense.

The participants in the seminar, *Le Monde* reports, concluded the level of present military cooperation between West European countries "cannot cause great satisfaction." According to complaints by Renaud Bichy, associate of the General Secretariat of National Defense, who addressed the seminar, West Europe spends "only just" 8 billion dollars a year on military research and developing new types of weapons, significantly less than the sum spent by Washington for this purpose. Now it is planned to involve the EEC in the financing of militarist programs. It is suggested bilateral and multilateral cooperation be expanded in every way. In particular, expansion of collaboration is plannes between Paris and London in naval armaments and between Paris and Bonn in air defense and the production of weapons for ground forces. The plan's authors envisage each separate program should be implemented by "specialized" international consortiums.

Petrovskiy Meets Cypriot Foreign Minister

LD290341 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0242 GMT 29 Sep

[Text] New York, 29 Sep (TASS)—On Monday a meeting was held here between V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and G. Iacovou, Cypriot minister of foreign affairs.

In a friendly conversation, both sides noted the ongoing development of Soviet-Cypriot relations and the consolidation of cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Cyprus in various fields. Topical problems of disarmament and safeguarding comprehensive security were discussed as were issues connected with the work of the 42nd UN General Assembly session.

Both sides exchanged opinions on the Cyprus issue and fully supported the idea of convening an international conference on Cyprus to settle the international aspects of the problem.

The Soviet side reaffirmed that it is strongly in favor of a peaceful, just, and comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus problem in accordance with UN General Assembly resolutions and decisions by the UN Security Council. It supports the independence, sovereignty, and unity of the Republic of Cyprus.

Ministerial level talks will be held in Moscow.

Moscow Interviews Finnish Premier on Ties

LD251515 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1430 GMT 24 Sep 87

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Helsinki: The official visit to the Soviet Union of the president of the Republic of Finland, Mauno Koivisto, which will take place in the near future, is a very important event in Soviet-Finnish relations. These relations are being developed on the basis of the traditional Paasikivi-Kekkonen line.

The positive changes which have taken place in the international atmosphere influence the positive development of relations between our countries. This was stated today in an interview with Soviet journalists by Finnish Prime Minister Harri Holkeri. The prime minister noted that we here in Finland follow with great interest the fruition of Soviet initiatives mentioned in the article: "The Realities and Guarantees of a Secure World," by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev. The initiative of the Soviet leader for measures to strengthen security, to be implemented within the framework of the United Nations, is very significant for the fate of our planet. We value highly the agreement in principle reached by the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons. It is of historic significance.

Speaking about the bilateral relations between our countries, Prime Minister Holkeri noted that the extensive experience gathered of long-term economic cooperation is a good foundation for the future. We are hoping to solve the difficult problem of the current imbalance in trade between our countries.

Holkeri said in conclusion that in our view the current restructuring in the Soviet Union will open new, significant possibilities for the expansion of bilateral cooperation. A good example of this is the Saimaa Canal. Soon our countries will observe the 25th anniversary of the agreement on the leasing of the Soviet sector of the canal.

UK Units 'No Novices' in Invasion Training

PM250949 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 87 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Markushin "Rejoinder": "What Is the Advertised Destination"]

[Text] The British military department intends to embark in the very near future on the systematic training of units of its troops at the U.S. training center in Fort Chaffee (Arkansas). Reporting this, Britain's *The Independent* emphasizes a highly significant detail: The training base at Fort Chaffee is supplied with everything necessary to rehearse interventionist actions. It is possible, for example, to rehearse the capture of an airport or government institution, or a counterinsurgency operation—to train troops to be prepared, according to U.S. terminology, to "intervene wherever and whenever appropriate" and to react "to the most unexpected changes" beyond the country's borders.

There is no question the choice of location for this training is perfectly justified. After all, U.S. military specialists enjoy indisputable prestige among their NATO allies in regard to organizating interventions. Better teachers are unlikely to be found anywhere else.

In all fairness it must be said the British themselves are no novices in this work, as proved by their extensive experience in colonial wars. How about their participation in the intervention against Soviet Russia?! Look no

further than the "feats" performed by British airmen who flew above the "wild territory," described in a book intriguingly titled "The Day We Almost Started Bombing Moscow." The authors clearly regret that it is impossible to bring back the times when "it was still possible to unite and stifle bolshevism."

There is no doubt that British generals can teach anyone how to rehearse an invasion of a foreign land as well as any U.S. general, for example, beneath the banner of liberation. Such an exercise was held in the British Isles a year or so ago. The scenario of the exercise, code-named "Purple Victory," was widely advertised among the British forces personnel: The plan was to render military assistance to a friendly country attacked by a state bearing the invented but highly eloquent name of "Barbaria."

Similar scenarios are being developed for other exercises. At this point one must give due credit to the inventiveness of a propaganda apparatus which is too good at the methodology of arousing among soldiers the most sincere indignation and most burning desire to stand up for "the right cause."

This is seen not simply among soldiers. Advertising posters invite British youngsters "to test themselves as professional soldiers" and "help the nations defend peace and freedom." The propagandists of militarism spare no efforts to implant in the minds of future mercenaries [as published] the idea that the army is a "school of courage," an "organization for the bold, the strong, and the resourceful." The tales of participants in the South Atlantic campaign, eagerly welcomed by editorial offices, boil down to one common point: The British soldier is a special kind of soldier capable of acting with daring, coolness, and professionalism.

The image of such a "Tommy" is being intensely popularized in Britain today, when the British military are ready to follow the example of their U.S. partners in everything. One must rattle sabers in just as threatening a manner, keep an equally keen gendarme's eye on what is happening, be equally prepared to rush in wherever people may decide to live and think according to models that are unacceptable to London.

Gorbachev Book Published in Austria

LD281441 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Text] Vienna September 28 TASS—The Austrian publishers Verlag Orac put out collected speeches by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, dealing with the urgent problems of world and domestic policy of the Soviet Government, efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the struggle for peace, disarmament and international cooperation. The book comprises chapters "Armament-Disarmament in the Mirror of New Thinking", "Perestroyka in Society and the Economy", "Foreign Policy and International Affairs." Also published is Mikhail Gorbachev's short biography and his photos.

A preface to the book was written by Bruno Kreisky, Austria's federal chancellor between 1970 and 1983 and deputy chairman of the Socialist International. He stresses that materials contained in the book give an interested observer of international events a fair insight into the ongoing changes.

Helmut Hanusch, Verlag Orac director, said in a TASS interview that the Western world was following with increasing interest the reforms in the Soviet Union and its proposals on the problems of international detente and disarmament.

Soviet Magazine Publishes in Greek

PM251441 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[Report by unnamed own correspondent: "In Greek"]

[Text] Athens, 22 Sep—The bright cover of a new publication has appeared on bookstalls in Greek cities, immediately attracting the attention of the Greek reading public. It is the journal *Sovetskiy Soyuz*, well known in many countries of the world, which has been published in Greek for the first time.

Latin America & Caribbean

Further on Shevardnadze's Visit to Brazil

Press Statement on Arrival

LD281821 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 28 Sep

[Text] Brasilia, 28 Sep (TASS)—E.A.Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs, today began an official visit to Brazil.

At the capital's airport [on 27 September] E.A.Shevardnadze was met by R. Costa de Abreu Sodre, Brazil's minister of foreign affairs, and other officials. Among those who met him was V.F. Isakov, the Soviet ambassador to Brazil.

E.A. Shevardnadze made the following statement for the press:

"Our meeting with Brazil is occurring at a significant time.

"The regular exchange of personal messages between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Jose Sarney has imparted a new powerful impulse to the spiritual mutual attraction of our peoples and to contacts even on a state level, which were begun almost 160 years ago.

"In this sense, the first visit by a minister of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union to Brazil underscores quite a great tradition, but we are thinking increasingly of the future. 'All of Brazil is yet to come,' wrote the Russian scholar N.I.Vavilov, and today this premonition is coming true. And this is precisely what we want: for our bilateral relations to have a great future.

"The Soviet-Brazilian dialogue is acquiring a new quality at a time when a long-awaited breakthrough in solving the central problem of our time—the elimination of nuclear arsenals and other types of weaponry of mass annihilation—is taking shape in international life. The recent Soviet-U.S. accord reached in Washington on a future agreement concerning medium-range and operational-tactical missiles is a major step in the right direction. It was made possible, inter alia, thanks to the great moral and political support from the whole world community, including Brazil. Now it is a matter for practical implementation. Knowing your country's stance and respecting its international prestige, we hope to have a useful exchange of opinions with Brazil's leaders on problems of disarmament and international security.

"As a person who is not arriving in your country for the first time, I rejoice and I would like to say to all Brazilians: the land of Ruy Barbosa and Alencar, Villa Lobos and Lucio Costa, Jorge Amado and Oscar Niemeyer, Cavalcanti and Erico Verissimo, Pele and Ferreira da Silva, is dear to the Soviet people. In the coming days we will be bringing our countries and peoples closer together, and that alone makes us happy.

"May I take this opportunity to convey the very best wishes to the residents of this fine capital and wish the Brazilian people peace and prosperity."

Meets President, Foreign Minister

LD290347 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0231 GMT 29 sep 87

[Text] Brasilia, 29 Sep (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, who is in Brazil on an official visit, met with Jose Sarney, president of the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Eduard Shevardnadze handed the president a message from Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. The president expressed his sincere thanks for the message. It was noted with satisfaction that the regular exchange of messages by the leaders of the two states on topical issues of world politics testifies to the strengthening of mutual understanding and trust between the peoples of the two countries and to the development of Soviet-Brazilian relations on the basis of complete equality, mutual respect, and mutual benefit.

The president confirmed the invitation issued to Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to pay an official visit to Brazil. E. Shevardnadze reaffirmed President J. Sarney's invitation to pay an official visit to the USSR.

An exchange of opinions on key issues of world politics and bilateral relations was held in an atmosphere of warmth and friendship.

The president stressed that M. Gorbachev's foreign policy activity is being followed in Brazil with great attention and interest. He spoke highly of the Soviet-U.S. accords on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles, which open the way to even broader agreements in the disarmament area. The efforts aimed at eliminating nuclear and chemical arsenals, stated J. Sarney, meet the aspirations of the Brazilian people, who hope that they will be crowned with specific positive results.

The broadening of fruitful interaction between the Soviet Union and Brazil on the international scene was noted with satisfaction, and the mutual desire was expressed to extend this interaction, to bring about an improvement in the situation in the world, real disarmament—above all nuclear—and the creation of conditions for the secure and peaceful development of all countries.

The same day, talks began between Eduard Shevardnadze and Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre, the Brazilian foreign minister. The ministers were united in believing that safeguarding a stable peace in conditions of disarmament and a strengthening of trust is the key issue of today's world, which is becoming increasingly interdependent. E. Shevardnadze explained the conceptual views and the practical proposals set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's article "Reality and the Guarantees for a Secure World," and stressed that the establishment of the proposed system of comprehensive security must be carried out through the joint efforts of all states, acting above all within the framework of the United Nations and on the basis of its charter. As the 42d session of the UN General Assembly shows, the idea of general security is meeting with ever increasing understanding and support from the international community.

The Brazilian minister emphasized that the Soviet-U.S. accord reached in principle on medium-range and operational tactical missiles generates a faith in the reality of nuclear disarmament.

The sides agreed that efforts in the disarmament field must be as international as possible. The disarmament conference in Geneva could be a good forum for this. The need was stressed in particular for an urgent solution to the problem of halting the testing of nuclear weapons, and of drawing up a convention on banning chemical weapons and destroying stocks.

Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre outlined the main principles of Brazil's foreign policy, and in this context, the essence of the initiative advanced in the United Nations by Brazil on the declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and cooperation. The Soviet side stated its positive attitude toward this initiative. The coincidence and closeness of standpoints on issues of strengthening peace and removing the threat of war were noted.

The talks are to be continued.

The Brazilian foreign minister held a reception in honor of Eduard Shevardnadze. The reception took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Brazilian Reportage

For Brazilian reportage on Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's official visit to Brazil, including his talks with Brazilian Foreign Minister Abreu Sodre and his

meeting with President Jose Sarney, see the Brazil section of the 29 September Latin America *Daily Report* and subsequent issues.

Ortega Urges Activation of Guatemala Accord

LD271007 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 27 Sep 87

[Text] Managua September 27 TASS—President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua has stated that the Reagan Administration continues the war against Nicaragua despite the efforts which are being made by the Central American countries to achieve a political settlement of the regional crisis.

Speaking in the "Face the People" radio and television program, he pointed out that the CIA's hirelings made bandit attacks on agricultural cooperatives every day, laid ambushes on roads, and killed defenseless peasants without sparing either women or children.

The Nicaraguan leader called on the republic's people to carry on the fight against the Contras, and reaffirmed the government's intention to work tirelessly for the sake of implementing the Guatemala agreement on a peaceful settlement in the region.

El Salvador Rebel Groups Ready for Talks

LD250954 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] Havana September 25 TASS—The Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front and the Revolutionary Democratic Front have officially stated their readiness to begin on October 4 this year negotiations with the El Salvador Government of Napoleon Duarte.

A communique circulated on Thursday by the *Salpress-Notisal News Agency* says that the leadership of the patriotic forces views as positive the government's decision to resume the peace dialogue with the insurgents without any strings attached, which is demanded by broad social and political circles.

Political & Social

Pyadyshev Briefs Press on Gorbachev

Back From 'Holidays'

LD291433 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS-Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists today that Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has returned to Moscow from holidays and has a packed working schedule.

Family 'Just Fine'

AU291428 Paris AFP in English 1427 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—The entire Gorbachev family "feels just fine", a Soviet Government spokesman told journalists Tuesday after Western media reports that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's prolonged absence from public view was caused by a food-poisoning attack, or that his wife Raisa had been operated for appendicitis.

Foreign Ministry spokesman Boris Pyadyshev, in response to a question at a news conference, also dismissed reports that Mr. Gorbachev, who reappeared in public Tuesday after a 53-day absence, had possibly been the target of an assassination attempt.

Mr. Pyadyshev said that West German media reports about the Soviet leader's health "are but false and nonsense, and have absolutely no grounds". He reiterated that Mr. Gorbachev had been on vacation, from August 24 to September 24, and "was feeling well during that period."

Asked about a report published in Sweden that Mr. Gorbachev's extended absence from Moscow was because his wife had to stay in hospital longer than planned, Mr. Pyadyshev said: "I would like to assure you that the whole Gorbachev family feels just fine."

Asked about a report that Mr. Gorbachev was leaving Moscow again Wednesday for an unknown destination, Mr. Pyadyshev said the Soviet leader had "a tight schedule of work, a very busy one."

"He has to deal with a lot of activities here in Moscow, and outside the limits of our capital too." He would not elaborate.

British-based media magnate Robert Maxwell told reporters here Tuesday that according to Soviet officials, Mr. Gorbachev was leaving Moscow on Wednesday.

The Soviet leader last year travelled to Krasnodar, in the southwestern Soviet Union near the Black Sea, where he announced the end of his summer vacation which he spent at an undisclosed location.

He then returned to Moscow on September 20 last year via his native Stavropol after being absent from the Soviet capital since August 19.

Kremlin 'Power Struggle' Suspected

DW291050 Hamburg BILD in German 29 Sep 87 pp 1,2

[Unattributed report: "Power Struggle in the Kremlin. Will Gorbachev Fall?"]

[Text] A dramatic struggle for power is apparently taking place behind the scenes in the Kremlin. It could even end in the fall of popular party chief Mikhail Gorbachev, Western diplomats and intelligence services in the Soviet capital suspect.

A so-called "diplomatic report" avaiable in Bonn says: Rumors about Gorbachev's health and a serious operation on his wife Raisa (burst appendix) have been circulated by his opponents to show him to be a weakling. In fact, however, Gorbachev has extended his vacation in order thoroughly to prepare decisions with his advisers to be made in the fall (missiles agreement, summit meeting with Reagan).

Gorbachevs antagonists are:

Soviet military representatives, deprived of political power for a long time, are irritated because he fired high-ranking military officials because of Rust, the amateur pilot who flew to the Kremlin.

CPSU Politburo member Yegor Ligachev and KGB chief Viktor Chebrikov fear that Gorbachev's reforms could lead to domestic unrest.

Chebrikov publicly mentioned the increasing demonstrations by national minorities—the Balts in Estonia and Latvia, the Crimean Tatars in Moscow, and the Kazakhs in Alma-Ata. Ligachev even praised the Stalin era, criticizing the political pluralism Gorbachev is striving for.

The economic functionaries do not want to give up their privileges; economic growth is decreasing.

The Politburo opposed the planned super-summit meeting on the occasion of the UN meeting in New York.

A Western diplomat in Moscow said of Gorbachev: The most interesting question this fall is whether "he can prevail once more, or whether he will disappear from the scene."

It was said yesterday that Gorbachev was attending to his official duties in the Kremlin again. Today he planned to receive a French delegation.

Yakovlev: Conservatives Hindering Reform

AU291300 Paris AFP in English 1246 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev Tuesday said that the Kremlin was committed to proceeding "at full speed" with its reform

policies, despite internal opposition from some conservatives who were "sometimes deliberately" trying to slow the pace of change.

At a meeting with British-based media magnate Robert Maxwell here, Mr. Yakovlev noted that "a lot of doubts" had been expressed about whether "perestroyka" (economic reconstruction) and "glasnost" (openness) would continue.

Mr. Yakovlev noted that some conservatives were "sometimes deliberately and sometimes unconsciously" slowing down the process of change, and that another category of people were hindering the reforms through inertia, Mr. Maxwell told reporters here.

The "conservatives" were not identified, although inside the Politburo, Party Number Two Yegor Ligachev and Ukrainian party boss Vladimir Shcherbitsky are generally considered in this category.

"I can assure you that no brakes are being put on the positive changes, and we are proceeding with the policies of perestroyka and glasnost at full speed," Mr. Maxwell quoted the Soviet official as saying.

Mr. Yakovlev, a close associate of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, said: "There are differences of opinion in our country", adding that he saw "nothing wrong" in such differences being fully aired. Only after issues had been debated "can the correct policies be established."

"Occasionally there have been cases of people clamping down on justified criticism," Mr. Yakovlev said.

He did not elaborate, but there has been criticism by dissidents of the introduction of new regulations by Moscow city authorities which effectively ban demonstrations. The regulations were introduced after mass protests outside the Kremlin by Tatars seeking to return to their native Crimea from where they had been deported during the Second World War.

"It can be said that some people do not need democracy and some do: I most certainly do," Mr. Yakovlev told the publisher.

Mr. Maxwell said he saw Mr. Yakovlev at the end of a two-day visit to Moscow for business talks, during which a "working group" was set up to explore the possibilities of cooperation on an English-language Soviet-edited newspaper which would "reflect the Soviet Union's point of view".

Asked whether a daily English-language version of the Communist Party newspaper *Pravda* was envisaged, Mr. Maxwell said "a verbatim edition could cause problems of marketability" in an English-language edition, an apparent reference to the paper's austere style.

A second working group was set up to discuss technical cooperation on computerised data bases, Mr. Maxwell said. He would not go into details on the working groups. Mr. Maxwell, who has international printing and communications interests, notably had talks here with *Pravda* editor-in-chief Viktor Afanasyev and Culture Minister Vasiliy Zakharov.

Ligachev, Dolgikh on Fuel Use Shortcomings

LD190915 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Sep 87

[Text] A conference was held today in the CPSU Central Committee on questions of the further development of technical progress in the sphere of converting the transport sector to natural gas, and the improvement on this basis of the atmosphere in cities and inhabited places.

The conference was opened with an introductory speech by Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He commented on the great economic and social significance of the measures being implemented in line with the decisions of the 27th party congress to further improve the structure of the fuel and power-engineering balance and to reduce the ratio of oil used for the production of various kinds of fuel.

Among the immediate and large-scale measures, the extension of the use in the economy of compressed natural and liquefied gas as engine fuel is envisaged and is an important direction of scientific and technological progress in the development of the transport sector.

Apart from economic considerations, the mass conversion of transport facilities to gas fuel is dictated by the heightened need to improve the atmospheric environment, especially in major towns which have a large stock of vehicles. Gas is the most ecologically clean form of fuel. The government recently adopted a number of decisions on accelerating the conversion of the transport sector to gas fuel, yet the targets set are being fulfilled neither on time nor to their full extent. There is a great deal of amateurism and lack of coordination in the organization of converting the transport sector to gas. Some ministries and departments, local party, soviet, and economic bodies do not attach the requisite significance to resolving this important problem.

Taking part in discussing the question were Ministers Chernomyrdin, Pugin, Lukyanenko; Comrade Kachura, secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee; Comrade (Savenkov), secretary of the Kemerovo Obkom; Comrade Saykin, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom; Comrade Vasilyev RSFSR first deputy minister of motor transport, and other comrades.

Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the conference. He stressed the pressing need to activate work on converting the transport sector to gas. In this context it was noted that the construction of gas-filling compressor stations is being implemented in an unsatisfactory manner, especially in Volgograd, Kirov, Kaluga, Simferopol, Novosibirsk, Taganrog, and some other cities. In a number of places, the production capacities of

the existing stations are poorly utilized. Generally throughout the country, they are only 30 percent utilized. To a large extent this is explained by the fact that the planning and supplying bodies of ministries and departments tolerate shortcomings in the allocation of gas-cylinder vehicles and the relevant apparatus. Frequently, such equipment is supplied to areas where there are no gas-filling stations and where their construction is not planned.

It was noted at the conference that in the resolution of the tasks of converting the transport sector to gas fuel, academic industrial science is weakly involved, and a comprehensive, systematic approach to this problem is absent. Particular attention is due to the training of qualified cadres to maintain equipment, to a fundamental improvement in the utilization of vehicle transport which has been converted to gas and in gas-filling stations, and to raising the provision of material incentives for the collectives of enterprises and organizations, particularly for drivers, to ensure the stable and economical operation of equipment working on gas fuel.

Local party and soviet bodies should increase their monitoring of the fulfillment of the targets on this question which have been set by government decisions, and take practical steps to implement the planned program of converting the transport sector to gas.

The participants in the conference acquainted themselves with the work of one of the Moscow gas-filling compressor stations, and with an exhibition of new kinds of equipment working on compressed and liquefied gas and gas-cylinder equipment.

Sakharov Provides List of Prisoners

AU290958 Paris AFP in English 0957 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharov said Tuesday he had given a visiting French politican here a list of 18 "worrying" cases of Soviet political prisoners held in hard labor camps.

The physicist told *Agence France-Presse* by telephone that he had given the list to Lionel Jospin, the first secretary of the French Socialist Party, who has since returned to France.

Other members of a French-Soviet friendship delegation from France were scheduled to meet here Tuesday with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, who had not been seen in public since August 7.

Mr. Sakharov said the 18 cases he listed were all prisoners condemned to long sentences. He said that they were doing "very poorly" and should all be freed as soon as possible.

Among the 18 is Mart Niklus, a dissident from the Soviet Baltic republic of Estonia who was sentenced in 1981 to 10 years of hard labor and five years of internal exile for "agitation and anti-Soviet propaganda."

He had already served an eight-year sentence from 1956 to 1964.

Mr. Sakharov estimated that the Soviet Union had about 400 prisoners of conscience. He said that moves were under way to free some of them but the process was going "very slowly."

Released Political Prisoners Meet Official

AU291548 Paris AFP in English 1540 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—Three former Soviet political prisoners, including the editor of the dissident review *Glasnost* (*Openness*) met here Tuesday with a high-ranking Foreign Ministry official, one of them, journalist Lev Timofeev, said.

Mr. Timofeev, Sergey Grigoryants, editor of *Glasnost* ,and Sergey Kovalev, a founder of Amnesty International's Soviet branch met with Yuri Reshetov, deputy head of the department of humanitarian and cultural relations at the Foreign Ministry.

Mr. Timofeev described the talks as "constructive," and a "very important and useful" first contact with the Soviet authorities.

He said it was "first sign of a de facto recognition" of the "*Glasnost* press club" to which all three dissidents belong.

He said Mr. Reshetov listened carefully to their comments on a possible human rights conference, which the Soviet authorities hope to organise in Moscow.

Mr. Kovalev served a seven-year jail term for "anti-Soviet activities" and was released in 1984. Mr. Timofeev and Mr. Grigoryants were both released this year.

Meanwhile, a family of three Jewish physicists who have been awaiting permission to emigrate to Israel since 1981 told reporters here they were starting a hunger strike.

Eduard Nadgornyi, 56, his wife Nina, 53, and their son Boris, 29, said they fast during the holding in Washington of a meeting of U.S. and Soviet physicians as part of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics. [sentence as received]

Attending the conference will be Mr. Nadgornyi's superior at the Institute of Solid Physics.

In 1981, after he asked to emigrate to Israel, Mr. Nadgornyi was denounced before 300 members of his institute, and demoted to a post of technician, while a laboratory he had created in 1965 was scrapped.

The physicist said his visa had been refused on the grounds that he knew "state secrets."

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Retires Grishin

LD181621 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT18 Sep 87

[Text] The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation has issued a decree on the early

termination of the mandate of the Supreme Soviet member 73-year-old Viktor Grishin. The decree follows a personal request from Grishin.

Earlier Grishin was relieved of senior posts in the Communist Party after his retirement on pension. Grishin was Moscow Communist Party leader and a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party's Central Committee.

Pitovranov Interviewed on Restructuring

AU281034 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 4 Sep 87 p 2

[Interview with Yevgeniy Petrovich Pitovranov, chairman of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, by Blazo Sarovic—place and date not given]

[Text] One of the first things that comes to mind at the mention of Soviet restructuring [perestroyka] is an image of numerous changes and rejuvenation of cadres in the Soviet state apparatus.

However, on its first visit to the Yugoslav Chamber of Economy, a USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry delegation was headed by the chairman of the Chamber, 72-year-old Yevgeniy Petrovich Pitovranov. Already his first appearance at the meeting with our businessmen at the Belgrade Sava Center, and, even more, the long and pleasant conversation with him, have shown him to be a man with modern views, whose whole being belongs to the present time. "Restructuring" [Perestroyka] is probably what it is because it issues from people and life, it does not work in set patterns.

We spoke with him at the end of his 7-day visit to our country and, as usual, we asked him about his impressions and about his talks with his host Pavic, Premier Mikulic, Vice Premier Zemljaric, and other figures whom he met.

[Pitovranov] Every member of the Soviet delegation and, I can say, also our Yugoslav partners at the talks, were very specific and open, basing the talks on the experience we have gained, taking into consideration our situation and relations on foreign markets, and our comrades from Yugoslavia took into consideration the economic difficulties that you are experiencing at the moment. The dominant question was what it is that we should be doing and how we should do it with a view to making the road of our cooperation clearer and more direct and increasing it. That is my basic impression. Both good intentions and interest in solving things in the best way were evident, as well as the awareness that not everything can be solved that way. We do have considerable difficulties in our cooperation and it would be both unrealistic and damaging not to recognize them.

Assembly and Then Metro [subhead]

[Sarovic] One of your statements has caused considerable excitement among Belgrade people. It was about the policy of constructing the Belgrade metro together with Soviet partners. Have you had more talks about this and other specific questions and has any agreement been reached?

[Pitovranov] There have been very many talks about specific issues. There were talks about the construction of a gas pipeline through Bulgaria and through Hungarian territory in the north. Yugoslavia needs these gas pipelines, and the Soviet side has expressed readiness to undertake all measures with a view to having their construction carried out as fast as possible and with as high quality level as possible. True, contracts have not yet been signed, but an agreement in principle has been reached. All members of our delegation who represented industry have briefcases full of specific proposals by Yugoslav organizations and they have left them with their partners to elaborate and study, and many of them are directed toward founding joint enterprises.

The Sarajevo Unis Combine has suggested founding three such enterprises. The question of the construction of a metro in Belgrade was discussed by the two sides earlier as well, but we do not have definite confirmation that it has been positively decided upon in Yugoslavia. We had talks in the Belgrade Assembly and were told that in principle the question of yes or no does not arise; they confirmed that it had been decided to build the metro. This town needs it and it is difficult to ensure solutions to traffic problems without it. However, this question has not been more thoroughly elaborated. According to your practice, such a decision should first be made by the Belgrade Assembly. We have accepted that we should first draw up a program on how the construction of the metro should be carried out. The group of experts that the Belgrade Assembly plans to form will include our experienced experts who have constructed metros not only in Moscow, but also in other Soviet towns. One must take into consideration that we shall construct the metro in the circumstances of owing Yugoslavia $1.5 billion, which, in our opinion makes it easier for Belgrade to acquire support by the FEC. The fact that our trade is not balanced is very favorable to the Yugoslav side.

[Sarovic] Restructuring [perestroyka] has spread over the entire life in the USSR. What is the essence of the changes in the economy, especially in economic relations with the world?

[Pitovranov] Our Yugoslav comrades know quite a lot about the essence of the restructuring that is under way in the USSR. I may be wrong, but all talks and all meetings that I and the members of our delegation have had show that what is happening in our country is very carefully watched in Yugoslavia. The essence of restructuring is a change from the bureaucratic mechanism of management in the economy to a mechanism where the decisive word belongs to producers of social goods, enterprises, associations, and industrial, scientific-technological, and scientific-productive organizations. The essence of restructuring is in the fact that we are carrying out the democratization of all economic and social life in

the country and introducing the broadest democratic principles in establishing who will manage specific parts of the country's life, including the economy, of course. As concerns foreign economic field, I believe that we have finished with the monopolist rights of the Foreign Trade Ministry in managing trade and economic links with foreign countries. These rights have been given, first of all, to the Ministry of Machine Building , but not only to it. We have 21 ministries and an institution within which material goods are planned to be exported from the Soviet Union. Those rights have also been given to 76 producing associations and enterprises.

Huge Internal Market [subhead]

[Sarovic] What does one get by changing the system of foreign trade relations?

[Pitovranov] Conditions are created under which the goods are sold by the one who produces them because he is interested in making those goods as competitively as possible with a view to winning a market, the difficult world market.

[Sarovic] The value of the total production in the USSR accounts for one-fifth of the world production, while the proportion of Soviet products in world trade is only a 25th part of that trade. Why are the products produced in socialist countries in an inferior position in world market?

[Pitovranov] I would try to answer this question in the following way: One should always bear in mind the huge consumption of the Soviet internal market. One should also consider the difficult conditions in which our country created and restored its economy after World War II, along with the full mobilization of all the country's forces with a view to creating a counterbalance to the nuclear arms made by the United States. All these facts have led to insufficient activity by the Soviet Union in foreign markets. The very fact that we have created an economy that has made us the second country in the world in that respect speaks of the potential capabilities, or I can call it the accomplishment of the Soviet people. Apart from the reasons I have mentioned, there are also subjective reasons that the economy failed to attain a higher level.

We have allowed mistakes in the organization and work of the overall economy of the country.

Now our reform, which has not been completed but is being carried out in stages, presupposes the greater independence and initiative of enterprises, direct appearance on foreign markets, greater utilization of the possibility of founding joint enterprises, wider cooperation, and utilization of the Soviet Union's colossal scientific-technological potential. We have given the Yugoslav Chamber of Economy a list of the many inventions of our scientists, constructors, engineers, and workers who have been given awards in developed capitalist countries—inventions which we, due to our weaknesses, still have not adopted—and we asked our comrades from Yugoslav economic organizations to join us in thinking about how we can realize together this most precious capital created by the human mind in the interest of the Soviet state and socialist Yugoslavia.

[Sarovic] To what extent does the economic protectionism in the world affect the appearance of products from socialist countries?

[Pitovranov] We have, for instance, considerable cooperation with the United States; the American-Soviet Trade Council has met in New York; we had talks with U.S. businessmen and we told them that if they want to develop trade with us they should ensure the most favorable regime for us, the same conditions as they have in trade with other countries. Businessmen understand us, it is in common interest that it be like that, but things are not quite like that. The same measures of prohibition and protectionism are introduced against other socialist countries as well. Understandably enough, we cannot be interested in outdated equipment. We sell that which is best in our country, for nobody will buy that which is less good. Protectionist measures in world trade hamper the development of trade. Not only in our socialist countries but also in capitalist countries businessmen are convinced that this is so.

Not Only Trade [subhead]

[Sarovic] The USSR is Yugoslavia's most important trading partner. What significance do you attach to trade with Yugoslavia and in its total volume what does it mean for your country?

[Pitovranov] Trade with Yugoslavia is not considered trade in our country. Every Soviet man who works on these projects considers it his sacred duty to promote relations with Yugoslavia. Comrades Gorbachev and Renovica said this very clearly last December. This was also said very clearly when Comrade Shevardnadze visited Belgrade and had talks with Comrade Mikulic. The Soviet Union stands by those positions. By the way, Yugoslavia is the Soviet Union's ninth trading partner, which is not an insignificant thing.

[Sarovic] Nevertheless, this trade has recently been stagnating, and during last 2-3 years, one can say that it has been decreasing.

[Pitovranov] Its physical volume has not been reduced. The physical volume of our deliveries to Yugoslavia is not smaller. The reason lies in the price fluctuations, but the essential reason lies in the structure of our exports. Due to deficiencies of our economy and our industry, first of all the deficiencies of machine building, we failed to ensure stability in the exports to Yugoslavia.

Serious and big tasks such as this cannot of course be performed in a day. However, we shall not be slack for one single day. Demands we impose on ourselves will be very strict. We have realized that this is a vital question for us.

[Sarovic] In your opinion, what should be done in order to promote overall economic relations between our two countries and what is your view of the future of those relations?

[Pitovranov] The answer is short: There is no single lever or single support for changing everything. One should utilize an entire range of measures, measures that should be implemented by Soviet and your organizations in conformity with the agreement that has been reached by our countries' leaders. This implies utilization of classical forms of foreign trade which are always there, but also clearing account trade, barter projects, and the like.

[Sarovic] There are also some reserves. What are they?

[Pitovranov] We have warned comrades from Yugoslavia in a comradely way, perhaps even reproached them a little, that they have directed themselves only toward a limited area of the Soviet economy, meaning the center--Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev—and much less toward other regions, such as the Baltic regions, that they have perceived the possibilities of Siberia very poorly, the possibilities of Kazakhstan not very well, and of Central Asia, the southern republics very poorly. These are the reserves.

We also have a wide field for using new forms of cooperation. There is, first of all, scientific-production cooperation. We have received many interesting proposals during the several days we spent in Yugoslavia, and many of those proposals will undoubtedly be realized.

We have good examples in agriculture. These are the PKB [the Belgrade Agricultural Combine] and the Kuban. This is an excellent example of cooperation. It was with great pleasure that I listened to Milojko Veljovic, general director of the PKB. I invited him to visit Moscow to talk about some practical questions, because the agricultural complex is obviously a branch that has good prospects for cooperation.

Gasoline Lines Reported in Kiev

AU281654 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 25 Sep 87 p 3

[Report by PRAVDA UKRAINY special correspondents I. Gorkun and V. Sharov: "Who Is Last in the Line for Gas?"]

[Excerpts] Here is a fragment from a telephone conversation:

"Is that *Pravda Ukrainy*?"

"Yes, it is."

"Do you know what is going on at filling stations in Kiev?"

"No, we do not. But what is the matter?"

"Just come and have a look."

Right away we went and visited six Kiev filling stations. The automobile lines in front of each of them were several-hundred meters long.

We questioned those who at moment were filling up their vehicles. "How long did it take to reach the fuel pump?" "Some 3-4 hours," was the answer. Some drivers had arrived to fill up before 7 in the morning, and we spoke to them about one in the afternoon...

As is known, there is nothing worse than waiting just to catch up later on, and here people were waiting in line for 3-4 hours, and in working time at that... We would not dare to repeat verbatim in print the conversations we overheard among the drivers. Most of them were in rotten spirits. Viktor Petrovich Osadchiy, a driver at the specialized administration for mechanization under the "Kievremstroy" trust, told us:

"There have been troubles with gasoline for several weeks. It is a nuisance to waste time filling up daily, but without gasoline one cannot drive..."

"And who, in your opinion, is to be blamed for the situation which has arisen?"

"What a question to ask: of course, the State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products." Viktor Petrovich was seconded in his opinion by Nikolay Ivanovich Berezanskiy, a driver on the staff of the Kiev "Spetsmebel" factory:

"Holdups in fuel supplies have even occurred before, but the present situation is unprecedented."

What is the position of the State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products? V. M. Novikov, chief of the State Committee's Kiev territorial administration, tried to highlight this position in the newspaper *Vechernyy Kiev*. In particular, he referred to the fact that in the third quarter of the year there have been big delays in gasoline supplies to the city. The plants that produce fuel have to be blamed for this.

But Viktor Mikhaylovich did not mention the fact that, as a rule, such automobile lines have formed in front of filling stations before the end of each quarter. This is only natural. After all, having paid the State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products money for fuel and having obtained coupons in exchange, each enterprise wants to receive this fuel in full, because in the next quarter there will be other coupons in circulation. In our opinion, this is the main reason for the lines. [passage omitted]

Kiev driver N. V. Shelest proposed a solution:

"Would it not be more simple to abolish the time restriction on the use of the coupons? We will get rid of of the lines at filling stations at the end of each quarter."

What is the opinion of the Ukrainian State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum products?

Economic

Deputy Finances Minister Interviewed

PM281055 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Sep 87 pp 1-2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences B. Senchagov, USSR deputy minister of finances, by correspondent Ye. Kubichev: "Finances Should Work"; date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum stressed that a radical financial and credit reform and the all-around financial normalization of the national economy are needed to create an integral, effective, and flexible system for managing the economy making it possible to make the maximum use of the advantages of socialism. The package of documents adopted since the plenum by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers includes the resolution "On restructuring the financial mechanism and enhancing the role of the USSR Ministry of Finances under the new conditions of economic management." Today Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Senchagov, USSR deputy minister of finances, answers our correspondent's questions on the essence of this document and its significance for the country's economy.

[Kubichev] Vyacheslav Konstantinovich, the document in question provides for truly radical measures. What has caused the need for such drastic changes?

[Senchagov] There are many reasons but, briefly, the main one is the far from brilliant financial results of the national economy. The underestimation of the role of the financial system, of economic methods of management, and of commodity-money relations and the weakening of the principles of financial accountability in the organization of economic activity had their effect. Responsibility for the zealous management of the economy and the fulfillment of financial plans and duties to the state was diminished. The enterprise ceased to be wholly answerable for the non-loss making or profitable nature of its work. From being an active lever for influencing production and its structure and effectiveness, finances have become a system for providing a financial resources service for plan decisions taken without a consideration for the demands of the laws of cost, monetary turnover, and supply and demand. The intolerable growth of loss-making and the dimensions of state subsidies, the hope which those who work in a slipshod manner pin on aid from the state budget, in brief, dependence in its worst manifestation, were the culmination of all this.

The other side of this situation was the weakening of the role of the country's consolidated financial balance and state budget in regulating the sectorial and intersectorial proportions of social production. For instance, the proportion of sectors in the sum total of capital investments in the industry which services the population's requirements and which has a high financial return—I have in mind primarily the so-called "B" group—was extremely low (about 9 percent). An utterly paradoxical situation took shape: What is essentially advantageous to the national economy and the population and ultimately provides more accumulations—37 percent of the total sum for industry—was relegated to the background in distributing capital investments. The residue method has become widespread in developing not only the social sphere but also the entire complex of sectors and production facilities working to satisfy the population's requirements. A breach has arisen between the turnover of financial and credit resources and monetary means and the movement of material values. That is one reason why our present ruble does not completely fulfill its role as an all-encompassing yardstick of the results of labor and an active instrument of financial control over the state of the economy.

Now an end will be put to all this. The restructuring of the financial system is now based on fundamentally new approaches toward the organization of financial relationships in the national economy and the demands of the USSR Law on the Enterprise are the compass for them. Everything contradicting the letter and spirit of this law will be resolutely eliminated. Economic initiative, full financial accountability, and self financing will be given financial priorities but on the essential condition that responsibility for the end results of economic activity is stepped up at the same time. In other words, it is a case of transferring financial relationships to the footing of stable economic normatives not subject to anyone's arbitrary decisions and enabling the enterprise to have a clear idea of its financial future. The resolution clearly indicates that the confiscation and redistribution of enterprises' profit and other financial resources over and above the set normatives, norms, and rates and in cases not envisaged by legislation is forbidden. The ministries and departments must not interfere in the current financial activity of enterprises which bear full responsibility for the results of economic management. They must ensure the profitable and non-loss making nature of their work, make effective use of resources, and form and preserve their own working capital.

[Kubichev] The stable normative for deduction from profit which is now being given to the enterprise—a normative not subject to corrections—is a boon to the collective, there is no doubt. But will it not turn out that the state budget will experience difficulties as a result? We have already frequently had occasion to encounter instances when the desire to retain as much profit as possible can be discerned absolutely blatantly in some economic leaders...

[Senchagov] That is intolerable, and the state cannot proceed along this path. After all, public consumption funds must grow. There can only be one way out here: If you want to have more funds, organize work in such a way as to obtain more income. The resolution makes

special provision for enhancing the economic responsibility of the basic production link for fulfilling its obligations to the state budget, for observing financial discipline, and—I stress this—for the reliability of reports on the results of activity.

In the 13th 5-Year Plan payments for resources will be combined with the taxation of current [raschetnaya] profit, which will step up the enterprise's incentives to self-development. As is well known, in 1988 some 30 sectors will work under conditions of full financial accountability and self-financing and in industry alone they will start to produce 60 percent of output. In the remaining years of the current 5-year plan the financial mechanism will still experience strongly the influence of stagnation phenomena formed in the past. In particular the profit taxation mechanism will not be used and normative payments to the budget will be quite significantly differentiated, particularly the normative for deductions from current profit into the ministry's budget and centralized funds. Nonetheless, despite these shortcomings, the new mechanism of relationships with the state budget will combine better than the previous mechanism the interests of the enterprises and the state. Of course, economic cadres need to do quite a lot of work to master this mechanism and learn to manage the economy on a normative basis.

One more important aspect of financial relations is a case of the irreversibility of losses in economic incentives in the case of bad work. For instance, unproductive losses, fines, and sanctions will directly affect a reduction in the income from financial accountability. I repeat, the transition to self-financing in no way relieves the enterprise of the fulfillment of its obligations to the budget. True, these obligations are not limitless. Previously it would happen that the better the enterprise worked and the higher its profit, the greater the constantly increasing burden it would bear regarding the budget and this completely discouraged any desire to improve its activity. Now payments into the budget are strictly financed on the basis of normative and production funds and labor and natural resources. If you make better use of resources, more will be left to develop the enterprise's production and social base. If it occurs to someone deliberately to conceal an enterprise's revenue or to understate them by categorizing them as production and turnover losses, the enterprise pays into the budget the entire sum of the understated profit. I am sure that is fair.

[Kubichev] There is another sphere of restructuring of the state financial system of lively interest to our readers. It is a case of the financial collaboration of the economic organs and the soviets of people's deputies, more specifically of how the improvement of territorial financial and budget planning is conceived.

[Senchagov] This sphere is no less important than enterprises' relationship with the state. For our enormous country with its great diversity of natural resources and existing national differences the improvement of the regional aspect of financial relations is a matter of paramount importance. We must proceed along the path of building a model whereby a region, having fulfilled its financial obligations to the general state budget, could have broad economic and financial autonomy and would be interested in earning funds for the harmonious development of its production forces. Henceforth the financial base of the soviets of people's deputies will be formed through deductions from the profit (income) of enterprises and again on the basis of stable normatives established before the plan is elaborated.

[Kubichev] In other words, now a gorispolkom, for instance, will no longer need wait in fear and trembling for the director of a large enterprise to decide whether or not to give money, for instance, for the modernization of a centralized heating system?

[Senchagov] Exactly. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution recognizes that it is essential for the enterprises (associations) of all ministries and departments to take part in the formation of local budget revenue intended for financing the development of territories' infrastructure and amenities.

Another thing: The growth of local budget revenue is made directly dependent on the turnover tax coming from the production of consumer goods on a specific territory and also from the fulfillment of the state and cooperative retail trade turnover plan. This will make it possible to raise the responsibility of local soviets and economic organs for satisfying working people's urgent needs.

[Kubichev] It is perfectly obvious that the revolutionary transformations in the USSR's economy open up new opportunities in the sphere of foreign economic ties and the enhancement of their effectiveness. Naturally, special importance attaches to the development on a mutually advantageous basis of currency and financial relations with the CEMA countries. It is to be supposed that all this has the most direct bearing on the activity of the Ministry of Finances?

[Senchagov] Undoubtedly. It is a case of stepping up the financial system's influence on the consolidation and expansion of foreign economic ties, of creating conditions for the broad introduction of currency self-recoupment and self-financing into the national economy. There are many tasks in this sphere set before the USSR Ministry of Finances and you cannot enumerate them all within the framework of a newspaper interview. But since we have paid our main attention to enterprises I shall say that we have been assigned the preparation of proposals to improve the mechanism of economic incentives to enterprises in increasing exports and developing new, progressive forms of cooperation with foreign countries, including the creation of joint enterprises and international associations and organizations. For instance, the sides' interest in investing funds—the long-term orientation, so to speak, toward joint production and commercial activity—depends on the correct mechanism for profit distribution and taxing joint enterprises.

It is very important that the currency deductions earned can rapidly be incorporated in production deeds, and this requires their unimpeded conversion into the necessary commodities.

The ministry of finances has to elaborate proposals for improving the credit and currency and financial economic mechanism of the socialist community countries and for enhancing the interest of enterprises, ministries and departments, and local soviets in the active use of the advantages of the international division of labor.

[Kubichev] The resolution we are discussing today gave a keen assessment of the activity of the USSR Ministry of Finances in the recent past. It notes in particular that the ministry paid little attention to elaborating proposals connected with the state's long-term financial policy, the improvement of financial planning, and the enhancement of the effectiveness of the economic mechanism. The forms and methods of work have essentially not changed and have failed to help influence the enhancing of production efficiency. In this connection I think our readers will be interested to hear from you how the content of the Ministry of Finances' work is changing and what style and methods are being established in it.

[Senchagov] First of all work is becoming more interesting and mutual understanding and business contacts are being established with the economic facility, central economic departments, and banks, cadres are being renewed, and it may be said that a changeover of generations of financial experts is under way.

Our main task is to elaborate as early as the end of 1987 in conjunction with the USSR Gosplan, USSR Gosbank, and USSR State Committee for Prices a special program for the financial normalization of the national economy as a whole. What we have touched on in this conversation is only a small part of an enormous amount of work.

We understand regularization on a broad plane. It includes the reorientation of the proportions of social production in the direction of group "B" sectors and services. It includes the transition from the policy of earmarking money resources to earning them on the basis of the principles of full financial accountability and the normalization of monetary turnover on this basis. It includes the regularization of the enterprise's balance by selling all unnecessary equipment, the radical solution of the problem of such importance to our economy; that is, above-norm reserves of commodity stocks. It includes purposeful work to eliminate loss on the basis of the respecialization and specialization of production facilities—right up to closing inefficient ones. Finally, we must have a new, untraditional approach toward the problem of accounting in the national economy. Today the accounting procedure is complicating and delaying the turnover of material values. Enterprises' nonpayments to each other totalled R38 billion and are swallowing up working capital. The transition to self-financing is aggravating this problem. Of course, it is not a question of a general amnesty for debts but we must analyze in depth the reasons for nonpayments and postpone the deadlines for paying some debts. But that, of course, is not the main thing. We must develop a new mechanism of accounting and we will resolve this task in conjunction with the USSR Gosbank and the specialized banks which have now been created.

[Kubichev] What exactly is being done?

[Senchagov] The ministries, departments, and union republics in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Finances have now launched work to elaborate specific financial normalization measures. Recently 15 groups of specialists from our ministry went out to the republics and oblasts to study the financial situation and render methodological assistance. The potential of scientific research institutes and VUZ's has been put into operation. Untraditional, bold solutions are required from science. For instance, an in-depth scientific study is needed of the solution of the task, set by the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, of increasing the purchasing power of the ruble and gradually ensuring its competitiveness, primarily within the CEMA framework. Or take another, no less important, task—methods of taxing profit. This is all uncustomary and in no way tallies with fixed stereotypes and dogmas.

All the activity of the ministry and its local organs is aimed at ensuring that efforts are concentrated on strategic salients of the improvement of finances and the entire financial and economic service in the national economy. The complication is that we are having to do this under conditions of an economy which is really functioning. But this fact cannot serve as justification for a fragmented approach and half-heartedness—problems must be resolved comprehensively and promptly.

The Ministry of Finances has been set the task of implementing the state's tax policy. The new element in this business is the encouragement of cooperative and public organizations and individual labor activity, especially in important questions like the fuller satisfaction of the population's requirements for goods and services. For instance, concessionary taxation is used for this purpose. The system of taxes levied from the population is in need of improvement while observing the principle of social justice. I can say the same thing of the improvement of the practice of taxation under the conditions of the new methods of economic management—it should encourage the efficient activity of enterprises and consolidate state finances. We must change in the most resolute manner the style of work of financial organs locally.

Finally, a very important task of the USSR Ministry of Finances is the methodological leadership of the organization of bookkeeping in the national economy because it is a very important means of monitoring the rational expenditure of all types of resources, the authenticity of report figures, and the reduction of the turnover of documents. Under the conditions of new methods of economic management the role of accounting is increasing sharply. There is no doubt that there will be fewer

checks of any kind but their quality and analytical value and therefore their effectiveness and usefulness to the enterprise and state must increase so that we can put an end to any abuses. This approach to matters also requires a different attitude toward the selection, placement, and education of financial expert cadres, the improvement of their professional standard, and the formation of new thinking in them.

In brief, restructuring is above all persistent, purposeful, and, of course, creative labor. I should like *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya* readers to understand me correctly. Financial reform is part of the radical economic reform; perhaps even its determining part, for after all it was no accident that V.I. Lenin used to say that any radical reforms are doomed to failure unless we have success in financial policy. But, I repeat, it is only a part and its success will depend on the dovetailing of financial reform with the reform of prices and planning and on the transition of the sphere of the circulation of means of production to a wholesale trade footing. Only then will socialist reproduction acquire the necessary wholeness and will all individual phases and stages of the reproduction process mutually supplement each other while the country's monetary turnover and the financial state of the national economy will be based on the firm foundation of the intensification of production and the accelerated turnover of material values. We all have a very large amount of work to do still to respond with specific deeds to the demands of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum for the implementation of a radical reform of the state's financial and credit system so vitally necessary to the country's economy.

Self-Financing in Chemical Industry Viewed

LD252035 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1440 GMT 22 Sep 87

["Working in the New Way" program with correspondent (Mikhail Zmerenkov) and USSR Minister of the Chemical Industry Yuriy Aleksandrovich Bespalov]

[Text] [(Zmerenkov)] Yuriy Aleksandrovich, from 1 January 1988 all enterprises and organizations of the chemical industry will start work in the new economic conditions on the basis of financial autonomy, self-financing, self-recouping. Well, as experience shows, the changeover to the new forms and methods of management take place most successfully where people have prepared seriously for it beforehand. How are things in this respect at the enterprises of your industry?

[Bespalov] Prior to replying to this question I would like to note that the changeover of industry as a whole and indeed of our industry as a sector [zveno] of it means first of all raising the efficiency of work and increasing the supplies of chemical output to consumers. The possibilities of the chemical industry are unlimited. They are known to everyone.

The chemical industry is one of the most highly profitable areas of the national economy. I shall quote only one fact: Capital investments in the chemical industry and the associated industry [otrasl] in the 10th and 11th 5-year-plan-period amounted to R35 and R28 billion respectively. They were recouped in 3-4 years. Or another example: Because of the insufficient development of the homeland's mechanical engineering and the poor development of the production base of this industry of the national economy, our industry took on the main mechanical engineering load in the 10th and 11th 5-year-plan-period. Having handed over to the State Budget R17 billion of profit since 1980, the R4 billion which remained at our disposal is independently paying for 45 projects built on a compensatory basis or purchased from foreign firms. Toward this we are today delivering approximately one-third of this output which could be used and applied successfully in various sectors [otrasl] of the national economy. But I repeat: The purchase of equipment abroad is a forced step. We understand that the 12th 5-year-plan-period is that of mechanical engineering. From the 13th 5-year plan-period onwards we are hoping to receive from our mechanical engineering suppliers everything we need. This will enable us, chemists, to ascend to new targets in our development.

The transfer of our industry to self-financing is being carried out simultaneously with the putting into execution of the Law on the State Enterprise. Work on foreign currency self-recouping will be conducted more actively and on a large scale. What is more, the industry's science too is being changed over to the new mechanism, to full financial autonomy. Very little time has been allocated for all this. After all, current work—the formation of the plan for next year and the 13th 5-year plan-period—needs no less time devoted to it. By this I mean that now we are being confronted by major problems. But we have a program for action. We know what to do, how to do it, and when. We will be persistently working on its implementation.

Now, specifically, what has been done by us? All scientific-methodical work has been carried out. The training of directors, chief engineers, economists, in a word, of all leading personnel, has been completed. Drawing up specific economic norms is being completed now and state orders for output next year are being brought to the notice of each enterprise. State orders in our industry reach slightly over 60 percent.

For the remaining 40 percent of output orders must be collected by the enterprises themselves jointly with their suppliers. Further, we are making up teams which have to travel to locations, to enterprises, and carry out specific work directly with each enterprise's collective.

In October we will conduct an enlarged collegium where, with the participation of leading enterprises, we will be examining their readiness for the changeover to new conditions of management. Taking part in this collegium will be central planning bodies: The State Planning Committee, the Ministry of Finance, etc. Our discussion will be specific and to the point, taking into account the experience of work of supplying industries, and first of all of the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry.

But we, too, have our own experience of work in the new conditions. Four of our enterprises have this year already been working in the conditions of self-financing and self-recouping. These are the Shostka Association ("Shvema"), the Kursk Association "Khimvolokno," the Orekho-Zuyevo "Karbolit" and the Syzran "Plastik." The main conclusion from their activity is as follows: The principle of financial autonomy must without fail be brought to the notice of each work station—then the practical return will grow more quickly. This financial autonomy must apply throughout: from the director to the worker; speaking on a larger scale, from the ministry to each work station. Then we will without fail receive a specific return.

[(Zmerenkov)] Well, of late the Ministry of the Chemical Industry has frequently been criticized because of the low quality of output and this applies especially to the dyes. In the new conditions of financial autonomy quality will play a decisive role in economic indicators. How will this problem be solved now?

[Bespalov] We are now looking at the question of quality more widely. The quality of finished output is there for all to see. It has specific numeral indices. But they depend on the quality of scientific-research and development work, the quality of the design, the quality of the work of all links and of each worker individually. Of no small importance too is the quality of the economic decisions being taken. Hence the conclusion follows that the problem of quality is a comprehensive problem. I am profoundly convinced that we still have a very limited understanding of the economic essence of the concept of quality. So far we are living only by today, today's concerns, and we do not always stop and think about the economic potential of quality. The quality of dyeing depends not only on the quality of the dyestuffs. The point is that over 30 components are involved in the dyeing process. These are: Thickening agents, antistatic agents, ageing retarders, softening agents and a whole range of other components. The quality of the preparation of fabric also plays a significant role: Dirty and uncleaned wool and cotton will not be dyed by any dyes. The slightest infringements in compounding, in the technological process, will lower the quality of dyeing. By this I mean that it is not only a matter of dyestuffs, that the question must not be attributed directly to dyestuffs; that the question of dyeing is a comprehensive problem and is not just ours, of the chemists, but also of the consumers, and not only of the consumers of our dyes but also of those procuring the raw materials, namely State Agro-Industrial Committee officials. Therefore, if we want to rectify the state of affairs as regards dyeing, we must altogether rectify matters and every one must do so in his immediate work environment.

Everyone must answer specifically for his part of this problem. I don't want to say that everything is fine in our industry. Of course, we have our own problems too which we have to work at and we are now tackling them vigorously.

For instance, we are now producing over 500 brands of dyestuffs. By the way, no other single country in the world turns out that many brands of dyestuffs. Altogether 900 of them are produced in the world, but we produce 500. We will further increase production. But, after all, every increase requires immense capital investments. Every brand is virtually a new works. It is known that a competent, professional specialist can obtain any hue, any color range, having only three colors, the so-called triad of colors. Seventy-two out of the 500 brands mentioned by me have the state quality badge. Their share in the total volume of output is 25 percent. By the end of the 5-year plan period we wish to raise this figure to 40-45 percent.

This year we will be certifying another 51 brands of dye with the state quality badge, next year another 70. Quite good dyestuffs are produced by our Tambov "Pigment" association, Cheboksary "Khimprom" association, Ivano-Frankovsk organic synthesis works. Quite good chrome and direct and light-fast dyes are produced by the (Derbenevskiy) chemical works.

We are also working on improving the situation in this industry. For instance, we want to set up and we will set up in this 5-year plan period a color stylist center [Koloristicheskiy tsentr]. This will enable us to produce not only dyestuffs but also a dyeing technology. For each specific piece of fabric a dyeing formulation will be issued. We believe that this will be a significant aid in improving dyeing technology. Further we are setting up depots where full batches of dyes are made up. These depots will enable us to switch dyes around, stockpiling some kinds, turning out others. This will enable us to implement together with light industry, mutual cooperation with dyes and will considerably alleviate the situation as regards dyeing.

[(Zmerenkov)] Yuriy Aleksandrovich, during our recent conversation I remember that you mentioned the nonfulfilment by enterprises of the plan for individual kinds of output in the product list as being the main reason for the failure to meet contract obligations. In your view, will the changeover to financial autonomy, self-financing and self-recouping help to rectify such a situation?

[Bespalov] I am convinced that the changeover to self-financing and self-recouping is unthinkable without a sharply increased responsibility for the fulfilment of contract obligations. A fundamental improvement in supplies to consumers is precisely one of the main aims of the changeover of the industry to the new mechanism and for this it is necessary to fulfil the plan in the product list. Economic sanctions have worked previously. They are also being widely used now. But with the change over to self-financing failures to deliver are being linked up to material incentive funds, the wages of each member of a collective. Hence careless work by one worker can financially affect the entire collective. The responsibility of a collective as a whole and of its individual members is being raised immeasurably. But what puts us on our guard? I will take only one problem. This is the problem

of material and technical supply. Now it is not in line with the principles of the new economic mechanism. Measures are being taken to improve it: the reorganization of the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and the transfer to wholesale trade.

But all this does not coincide in time. For instance, we are facing the task now of drawing up contracts with consumers in September. September is virtually drawing to a close, but our enterprises cannot conclude contracts because of the lack of funds for material incentives. Not having funds, in accordance with the Law on the Enterprise, an enterprise cannot conclude contracts for the delivery of output to a consumer, and one gets a vicious circle; a failure to meet the deadline for concluding contracts can lead to a disorganization of the management of the economy, and of our industry.

A second factor which is also having an adverse effect is the unstable capital construction in our industry. The construction of chemical projects is the most labor-intensive building work. It has its own specific nature. There are many interplant supply lines. The working conditions in our industry are difficult, frequently harmful and dangerous. Builders are not very eager to accept orders from us, especially for technically reequipping enterprises in operation, even though economic interest has been introduced for builders, for our partners, working in our operating plants. But in practice this mechanism is so far not operating efficiently; hence delays in the commissioning of capacities, which leads to a disruption in the production of the product list. Only the all-round realization of all measures guarantees us normal stable work. This is an indispensable condition for the transfer to the new system of management.

[(Zmerenkov)] Also from January 1988 the State Acceptance Service output will be introduced. Well, as is known, preparing in good time for the introduction of the State Acceptance Service means avoiding many problems arising when working with it. How are things going at your enterprises?

[Bespalov] From 1 January of this year the State Acceptance Service was introduced in 64 enterprises of our industry. Quite a lot of preparatory work has been done. However, time has revealed our omissions. As a whole the State Acceptance Service did not exert any special influence on the nonfulfilment of planned deliveries in line with contracts in our industry: 1-2 percent of failures in planned deliveries solely because of the poor-quality work of enterprises in the conditions of the State Acceptance Service.

But individual enterprises had major failures. The Rubezhnoye "Krasitel" Association is constantly running a fever. Alone in January-February of this year the State Acceptance Service stopped the acceptance of output here. The (Mosbytkhim) had difficulty in making the transition to the State Acceptance Service. There are many complaints regarding the quality of the output produced here.

The main reasons for these difficulties are known. We ourselves know them well and are working on them. They are: Breaches of technological discipline, poor-quality raw materials, inefficient work by the administration of enterprises, obsolete technology and equipment, low technological discipline, a poorly conducted revision of documentation on standards and technology. Indeed the revision of this documentation was carried out by us with some delay.

Already working in the conditions of the State Acceptance Service, we resolved, jointly with the State Committee for Standards, a number of questions, such as the transportation of output in a packaged shape, the parallel carrying-out or the combination of long-term analyses by OTK [Technical Monitoring Department] and State Acceptance Service officials, the combination of the operating conditions of OTK and the State Acceptance Service. The volume of accompanying documentation on handing over output to the State Acceptance Service has been considerably reduced, and a whole range of other questions.

I want to remark that, according to the existing tradition, those drawing up the standards for products do not take into account the spheres of their application: Now in the conditions of the State Acceptance Service the analyses must be carried in full volume, for 100 percent, regardless of the consumer. In our view another approach is needed: Standards for products must be created taking into account their spheres of use.

Frequently we have to secure for the customer some single quality indicator and the remainder is guaranteed by the technology. Then it is not necessary to check all numerous parameters. Here there will not only be a quality effect but also an economic effect, since often the quality of the product does not not need to be raised for the consumer who uses it in secondary specializations. But we make demands on the quality of output in line with the very highest criteria.

[(Zmerenkov)] In other words, you don't need a polished diamond to cut glass? This is now I have understood this.

[Bespalov] Absolutely correct. Diamonds are needed. Brilliants are needed and ordinary cutters are needed and each one has its own place in the national economy. Such an approach, as we believe, will yield a considerable saving both of material resources and of labor expenditures. Our institutes have now taken up this work and we are expecting a great effect from it. Or take the following problem. Throughout the world for the manufacture of paint and varnish products refined oils are now being used. The State Agro-Industrial Committee does not supply us with such oils. This affects the quality of paint and varnish products. Our numerous talks have not resulted in this problem being solved. We are now creating an installation for refining oils at our enterprises. We believe that this will solve the question. We have great grievances about the quality of cellulose being supplied by the Bratsk cellulose and cotton combine. Up till now the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining

and Petrochemical Industry is not supplying us with high quality rubber for the production of polystyrene sheet which is being used in the production of refrigerators. Work in the conditions of the State Acceptance Service has also shown that no less than 50 percent of the complaints about products, especially regarding consumer goods, are connected with the quality of the packing material: The low-quality thin sheetmetal of Karaganda metallurgical works of the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and the bad cardboard of the Kiev paper combine of (Glav)snab.

As a whole we must say that we are devoting little attention to packing materials, while sometimes the question of packing is determining in marketing some or other output, especially consumer goods. For instance, synthetic detergents: We are fully meeting the national economy's needs for them but the appearance of these containers, the consumers and buyers can see for themselves what state they are in—there is no good quality cardboard and it is impossible to use it for quality printing, even though we have dyestuffs for this, and good dyestuffs at that.

Of course all these questions need to be solved urgently and jointly with our suppliers. Otherwise, if we don't solve them, questions of quality will be constantly on our agenda. From next year onwards the State Acceptance Service is being introduced at another 57 of our enterprises. Taking into account this year's experience, we are now working on preparing them for such a changeover. As a whole, from next year onwards, over 60 percent of our output will be submitted to the State Acceptance Service. This imposes a certain great responsibility on our services of the ministry and on our enterprises. We understand this problem and are now vigorously working on eliminating the errors in our work which have come to light, and taking into account the experience which we will acquire during this current year in the conditions of the work of the State Acceptance Service.

[(Zmerenkov)] Yuriy Aleksandrovich—a last question. The sixth "Khimiya-87" international exhibition has just ended; as is known, you were the chairman of the organizing committee. What are the results briefly?

[Bespalov] The Soviet and foreign media have called the "Khimiya-87" exhibition a major international public showing of this year's achievements. I would agree with such a claim. In the Soviet section over 3,000 exhibits were on display and altogether over 1,500 firms and organizations from 31 countries and West Berlin took part in the exhibition's work. It must be said that all were agreed that the scientific-technical level of the exhibition held is fairly high. Shown here were both new technological inventions [razrabotka] and new design solutions in the sphere of equipment. Over 1 million people visited the exhibition. The commercial center was in operation from morning till late in the evening. Its specialists have calculated that the total amount of contracts concluded amounts to almost R3 billion which is double that at the "Khimiya-82" exhibition.

Taking this into account, we are now in the management bodies considering the question of raising the exhibition to a higher level and of turning the exhibition into a fair for the sale of chemical goods and chemical equipment. The exchange with foreign firms has also shown great interest on their part in organizing a fair. Also the organizing of fairs should be carried out not with a 5-year cycle but with a 3-4 year cycle, because chemistry is a rapidly developing industry and virtually every 2-3 years there is a renewal both of processes and of equipment.

Well, there is a great deal more one could say about "Khimiya-87." Inasmuch as our conversation is drawing to a close, I will note only that our slogan "Chemicalization of the National Economy is a demand of the Time" has been fully justified by the exhibition.

Agricultural

Kazakhstan Seeks Help To 'Save Harvest'

AU250752 Paris AFP in English 0740 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 25 (AFP)—Authorities of the Soviet Central Asian republic of Kazakhstan, where farmers are struggling to bring in the grain harvest in the face of bad weather, have appealed on television and radio to the local population to help "save the harvest", a Soviet daily said here Friday.

A Kazakhstan Central Committee statement said that the situation in the north of the republic "continues to be extremely difficult" owing to incessant rain and the threat of frost, the army daily *Krasnaya Zvezda* reported.

According to western experts here, it was thanks to good results in Kazakhstan last year that the Soviet Union was able to announce a bumper harvest of 210 million tons in 1986.

Kazakhstan leader Gennadiy Kolbin went on television to call for "all resources" to be mobilized to step up the harvesting effort. Extra army units had already heeded the call, the paper said.

In a separate article, the paper said that a recent cyclone which lasted a whole day in the Volga region of Ulyanovsk, flooding the crops, had also held up harvesting.

Soviet officials and the media have in the last 10 days stressed the effect of bad weather on the harvest, leading western experts to predict the results will be well under the planned 232 million tons.

Harvesting, Plowing Progress Reported

PM280847 [Editorial Report] Moscow *Selskaya Zhizn* in Russian on 24 September 1987 front-pages two TASS reports under the general heading "The Situation Demands Organization", which read as follows:

"The USSR State Committee for Statistics reports that as of 21 September 96.1 million tonnes of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been cut and 89.8

million hectares threshed. This represents 83 percent of the sown area. In the bad weather conditions the pace of work on the grain fields remained slow last week.

"As yet only 10 percent of the sown area of sunflowers and 15 percent of the sown area of sugar beet have been harvested. Half the potatoes have not yet been lifted. Some 45 percent of vegetables have been picked. Some 872,000 tonnes of cotton has been procured.

"The foundation for next year's harvest is being laid. Some 28.5 million hectares of winter crops—74 percent of the target—have been sown and 38.4 million hectares—34 percent of the plan—have been fall-plowed.

"Time demands that all fall field work be accelerated."

"Farmers' Success [subhead]

"Tula farmers have supplied 700,000 tonnes of grain to the motherland's granaries. They have thereby overfulfilled the plan for sales of grain to the state by more than 50 percent. Yefremovskiy Rayon farmers have scored a great success. They have sent almost 75,000 tonnes of grain to the elevators—more than anyone else in the oblast. Farms have met all their needs in seed and forage. The sale of grain to the state continues."

Central Committee Resolution on Private Plots

PM281515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 87 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under general heading "In the CPSU Central Committee": "The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers Have Adopted Resolutions 'On Additional Measures for the Development of Citizens' Personal Plots and of Collective Horticulture and Truck Gardening' and 'On the Further Development of Subsidiary Farms of Enterprises, Organizations, and Institutions'"]

[Text] For the purpose of creating more favorable conditions for the development of citizens' personal plots and of collective horticulture and truck gardening and eliminating the major shortcomings existing in this work, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have made it incumbent upon union republic communist party central committees and councils of ministers, the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee [Gosagroprom], kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, autonomous republic councils of ministers, and krayispolkoms, oblispolkoms, gorispolkoms, and rayispolkoms to implement effective measures to encourage the production of meat, milk, potatoes, vegetables, fruit, berries, and other agricultural products on citizens' personal plots and in collective gardens and truck gardens. Special attention is to be given to the development of cooperatives of citizens' personal plots with social production on contractual terms applying the principles of collective and family contracts.

It is laid down that the size of plots and the norms for livestock and poultry to be kept on citizens' personal plots are to be determined by rural and village soviets of people's deputies, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes with due consideration given to the participation of kolkhoz members, sovkhoz workers and employees, and other rural residents in social production.

Kolkhozes are instructed, and sovkhozes and other agricultural enterprises are authorized, to make broader use of rental contracts for the long-term leasing of additional plots of land to kolkhoz members, sovkhoz workers, and other citizens living in the countryside who have expressed the desire to rear livestock and poultry or to grow potatoes, vegetables, berries, greens, feed, and other crops for sale under contracts with farms and consumer cooperative organizations.

The USSR Gosagroprom, union and autonomous republic councils of ministers, and local ispolkoms have been set the task of elaborating and implementing specific measures to significantly expand the sales of young livestock and poultry to the population's personal plots.

Sovkhozes and other state agricultural enterprises are authorized, and kolkhozes are instructed, to sell horses and other draft animals to citizens with the right to keep them and use them for work on personal plots or to perform work under contract with the farms.

It is deemed expedient to organize beekeeping societies in rural rayons, supply them with the necessary stock and mobile platforms, and improve the work of beekeepers with a view to fully satisfying the citizens' needs for bee colonies.

Party committees and soviet and economic organs are instructed to show greater concern for the provision of housing to kolkhoz members and to workers and employees of kolkhozes and other agro-industrial complex enterprises.

Sovkhozes and other agro-industrial complex enterprises and organizations located in the countryside are authorized, and kolkhozes and consumer cooperative organizations are instructed, to sell to their workers farmstead-type houses and outbuildings constructed using either state capital investments or the own resources of farms, enterprises, and organizations, with these workers having to repay 40 percent of the cost of the farmstead-type house and outbuildings in equal monthly installments over a period of 50 years from the day of sale.

In order to generate more interest in the development of individual housing construction in the countryside and the running of personal plots, provision is made to give citizens living in the countryside credits:

to build individual houses and outbuildings up to a total amount of R20,000 with repayments over 50 years starting in the 3d year following receipt of the credit;

to build outbuildings to keep livestock and poultry up to a total amount of R4,000 with repayments over 10 years starting in the 3d year following receipt of the credit;

to acquire small-scale mechanization equipment for work on the personal plot up to a total amount of R1,000 with repayments over 3 years.

It has been decided to increase the amount of credit available to citizens to purchase cows and calves to R1,000 and R500 respectively, such credits to be repaid on the terms laid down in current legislation.

It has been deemed expedient to add to the total work service of women with small children, and therefore not employed in social production, any time spent by them on rearing livestock and poultry or growing potatoes, vegetables, greens, and other crops on personal plots under contract with kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and consumer cooperative organizations.

It has been decided to speed up in every oblast, kray, and autonomous or union republic not subdivided into oblasts, the completion of the elaboration of plans for the siting of collective gardens and truck gardens, with due provision for proper amenities, power and water supply, and provision of telephone communications by rayons. The land allocated to collective gardens and truck gardens should come from the state land stock including, whenever necessary, land belonging to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises. It is also necessary to bear in mind the possibility of organizing horticultural associations of kolkhoz members and workers of sovkhozes and other agricultural enterprises living in multistory housing blocks.

It is laid down that the allocation of land plots for collective gardens and truck gardens in line with approved siting plans is to take place on the basis of rayispolkom (gorispolkom) resolutions within 1 month from the date of application.

Enterprises and organizations under the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, and other USSR and union republic ministries and departments are instructed to speed up work on the provision of water and power supply and construction of amenities for collective gardens and truck gardens with a view to completing the bulk of this work within the current 5-year plan period. This work must be done under direct contracts with horticultural associations and must be included in the plans for contractual work and volume of services performed.

Members of horticultural associations are authorized to construct on the land plots allocated to them heated summer houses with a construction area of up to 50 square meters excluding balcony (veranda) area and loft space, as well as utility buildings (standing on their own or in blocks) to keep domestic poultry and rabbits, to store farm tools, and to meet other needs. Hothouses and other heated ground facilities can be erected on the plot to cultivate agricultural crops. The siting of cellars beneath the house or utility building is allowed. All former restrictions on the fitting out of garden plots are lifted.

The resolution authorizes the granting of credits to members of horticultural associations to build summer houses and amenities for garden plots up to an amount of R5,000 with repayment over 10 years starting in the 3d year following receipt of the credit.

Union republic councils of ministers, the USSR Ministry of Trade, the USSR Ministry of Health, the Tsentrosoyuz, and soviet and economic organs are instructed to improve trade and medical services for horticultural and truck garden workers, ensure full satisfaction of their demand for horticultural and garden stock and other goods, and develop the network of reception centers to purchase any excess of agricultural products grown by them. Particular attention is to be given to satisfying the population's needs for summer houses, construction materials, and transportation, construction, repair, and other services.

Union republic councils of ministers, the USSR Gosagroprom, the Tsentrosoyuz, and USSR ministries and departments are instructed to significantly expand the volume and range of paid services for citizens running personal plots and for horticultural and truck garden workers, and to encourage the development of cooperative and individual activity in this work. Special attention is to be given to the provision of services like cultivation of land plots, sale and application of fertilizers, application of plant protection agents, construction and repair of houses and utility buildings, rental of small-scale mechanization equipment and horticultural and truck gardening implements, dressing of domestic animal and rabbit pelts, processing of output on contract [na davalcheskikh nachalakh], and veterinary and agronomical services.

Instructions are given for every kolkhoz and sovkhoz and other agricultural enterprises, on the basis of accumulated experience, to organize links for the provision of services to the population in running personal plots and collective horticulture and truck gardening.

The USSR Ministry of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry are instructed to adopt additional measures to increase the output of mineral fertilizers and pesticides packed in quantities and range to fully satisfy the population's demands.

The resolution instructs autonomous republic councils of ministers and local ispolkoms, jointly with trade union organs and agro-industrial committees and associations, to make broader use of the practice of holding reviews and competitions for the best personal plot, garden, or truck garden and to organize appropriate fairs and exhibitions publicizing advanced experience. It has been deemed expedient to hold union-wide reviews of the work of citizens' personal plots, gardens, and truck gardens with the results being summed up at the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements and republic, kray, and oblast exhibitions, with incentives for the winners.

Attaching great importance to the further development of subsidiary farms of enterprises, organizations, and institutions in order to improve food supplies for labor collectives, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have made it incumbent upon USSR ministries and departments, union republic communist party central committees and councils of ministers, kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, autonomous republic councils of ministers, and krayispolkoms, oblispolkoms, gorispolkoms, and rayispolkoms to implement the specific practical measures to boost food production on subsidiary farms of enterprises, organizations, and institutions stemming from the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum demands. Orders are given to analyze the production and economic activity of each such farm, to take exhaustive measures to ensure the fullest possible utilization of potential to boost the output of meat, dairy, and other products so as to improve supplies for labor collectives, to impose proper order in the utilization of material, technical, and financial resources, to assimilate economic accountability [khozraschet] as quickly as possible, and to ensure profitable operations by subsidiary farms of the country's enterprises, organizations, and institutions.

Councils of ministers of union republics (not divided into oblasts), councils of ministers of autonomous republics, and krayispolkoms and oblispolkoms are ordered to seek out plots of land for the subsidiary farms of enterprises and organizations. If necessary they are authorized to hand over loss-making and low-profit sovkhozes or sections of them to enterprises and organizations in order to set up subsidiary farms, and to attach to them economically weak sovkhozes.

In order to increase fish production it is recommended that more extensive use be made of the potential of inland bodies of water and that they be attached on a long-term basis to enterprises, organizations, and institutions. To that end an inventory of existing ponds, lakes, and reservoirs is to be made before the end of the year, and questions pertaining to organizing subsidiary farms on the basis of them are to be solved.

When organizing subsidiary farms it is necessary to make more extensive use of the cooperative principle, set up joint fattening enterprises, livestock units, and hothouse combines by combining the resources of enterprises in different sectors, make maximum use of other organizational forms, and develop production links with kolkhozes and sovkhozes and interfarm enterprises more extensively on a contract basis.

Union republic communist party central committees, kraykoms and obkoms, union and autonomous republics' councils of ministers, krayispolkoms and oblispolkoms, and leaders of ministries and departments are instructed to elaborate and approve in 1987 plans for the development of hothouse farms for the production of early vegetables with a view to having 0.6-0.8 square meters of covered ground per city inhabitant by 1990.

The USSR Gosagroprom, union republic gosagroproms, and agro-industrial committees and associations are instructed, on the basis of applications from enterprises, organizations, and institutions with subsidiary farms, to ensure the allocation and sale of tractors and agricultural machinery, mineral fertilizers, and other material and technical resources (on the USSR Gosagroprom schedule) to them in accordance with the normatives laid down for kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the particular region, and to organize supplies of pedigree livestock and poultry, quality seeds and plants, veterinary and agrochemical services, and services for the repair of tractors and agricultural and other machinery.

The USSR Gossnab and USSR Gosagroprom are instructed to provide for the allocation, in line with ministries' and departments' requests, of the requisite technology for the construction of meat-processing and dairy shops, canning units, refrigerators, storehouses, and other production facilities on subsidiary farms.

When planning and constructing new power stations, gas compressor stations, and other enterprises with resources in the form of waste heat and remodeling and expanding existing ones the USSR Ministries of the Gas Industry, of Power and Electrification, of the Petroleum Industry, of Mineral Fertilizer Production, of the Chemical Industry, other USSR ministries and departments, and union republic councils of ministers are ordered to make provision for the obligatory creation of hothouse, fish, and other subsidiary farms and shops at them. In 1988-1989 all bodies of water at existing TETS's are to be brought into use for the production of fish.

The credit terms for expenditure on the organization and expansion of the material and technical base applicable to sovkhozes are to be extended to the subsidiary farms of enterprises, organizations, and institutions.

It is laid down that as of 1988 land reclamation work on the land of subsidiary farms is to be carried out in accordance with the procedures and on the terms established for agricultural enterprises.

If necessary, leaders of enterprises, organizations, and institutions are authorized, by agreement with oblispolkoms, krayispolkoms, autonomous republic councils of ministers, and the councils of ministers of union republics not divided into oblasts, to increase in newly organized subsidiary farms for the first 2-3 years the salaries of leading workers, specialists, and chief accountants by 1-2 grades above [the grade appropriate to] the planned volume of sales of products for the given year.

The USSR Gosagroprom, in accordance with USSR ministries' and departments' requests, is called upon to train and improve the skills of leaders and specialists of enterprises', organizations', and institutions' subsidiary farms and pay more attention to generalizing leading experience of the work of these farms.

The USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the editorial boards of central and local newspapers, TASS, APN, and other media are recommended to provide thorough, consistent, and well thought-out coverage of the process of solving the food problem in the spirit of the demands of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, generalize and actively propagandize the experience of restructuring of the agro-industrial complex on a new economic and organizational basis, boldly probe the socioeconomic processes taking place today in the countryside, and treat them in a lively and intelligible manner, revealing all their dynamism and contradictions. It is necessary to wage an uncompromising struggle against sluggishness, routine, and irresponsibility, do everything to back local initiative, enhance the social authority of those who are good managers, and actively participate in the restructuring of all socioeconomic life in the countryside.

Media Report 25-26 Sep Developments

LD270035 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 25-26 September. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

25 September

The fodder base in Turkmenistan is poor. The forage situation in Chardzhou Oblast is the most critical in the republic. Local feed crops producers are lagging behind the average republican level. Only one third of silage trenches have been filled. The pace of hay production is exceedingly slow. Rural workers from the southern oblasts are not doing well in putting in silage or collecting crude fodder. Milk production has fallen conspicuously in many farms in the Turkmen SSR compared to last year. The daily increase in livestock weight is also falling compared to last year. (0320)

In the Mari ASSR, non-black soil zone grains have been harvested from almost 90 percent of the area. Over 33,000 hectares remain to be harvested. Town dwellers are having to help out with the harvest here. (0330)

The country's potato crop seems to be coming in later than usual. One-and-a-half times fewer potatoes have been harvested than this time last year. However, it is expected that the crop will be the same as last year's. (0500)

Over 700 of Moldavia's best machine operators have travelled to Kazakhstan to help that republic's bread grain growers bring in their harvest. They are working today in Kustanay and Turgay oblasts. Representatives from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kirghizia, and Turkmenia are also working in Kazakhstan. The people of Kazakhstan are especially grateful to the representatives from Armenia and Moldavia, who travel to Kazakhstan every year to help out. Even though the harvest is difficult this year, it is a good one. The cold wave, which is now afflicting Kazakhstan's northern oblasts, is moving down into the southern and south-eastern oblasts. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Kazakhstan have sown almost 60 percent of the planned acreage in winter crops. East Kazakhstan agro-industry workers were the first to finish. (0810)

The threshing of bread grain is being conducted by the farms of Ust-Ordynskiy Buryatskiy on the last quarter of the bread grain fields. In Irkutsk Oblast it yields over 40 percent of the total harvest. On average across the oblast every hectare delivers 16 quintals of grain. On most farms more than 20 quintals of bread grain are harvested per hectare. (1100)

Seventeen million tonnes of hay, 200,000 tonnes more than envisaged in the plan for the year, has been stored by the sovkhozes and kolkhozes of Kazakhstan. Grass has been harvested from 30 million hectares. They have already stacked 14 million tonnes of hay near towns and farms engaged in livestock breeding. (1100)

Gorkiy Oblast has overfulfilled the plan for grain sales to the state, but potatoes have not yet been harvested from almost half the area there. Sixty thousand townspeople and students have been mobilized in the effort to harvest all the potatoes by 1 October. (1230)

Grain and pulse crops, not including corn, have been harvested on 20.5 million hectares in Kazakhstan. That is 87 percent of the overall area. Crops have been threshed on almost 18 million hectares. Almost 60 percent of the planned quantity of winter crops have been sown. (1330)

26 September

The farmers of Tselinograd Oblast have supplied the state with more than 2 million tonnes of grain. (0204)

While supplying the state with bread grain, farmers in Omsk Oblast are also supplying seeds. More than 500,000 tonnes, more than 90 percent of the plan, have been supplied. Farmers are paying particular attention to climatically stable seed, seed that is in short supply, and seed with good prospects. (0204)

In the eastern regions, large tracts of land remain unharvested, including many potatoes, vegetables, sugar beets, corn, and other late crops. It is not always the bad weather that retards agricultural work. In Ryazan Oblast, for example, a lack of organization has meant that only 12 of the 25 rayons have taken in one third of the potatoes in the 20 days or so that have elapsed since the work began. (0500)

The cotton harvest is now the basic task of Central Asian farmers. However, some oblasts worked poorly in September. As a result, Uzbekistan as a whole lags behind last year's harvest by half a million tonnes. To make up for this lag, the farmers have had to raise the pace of harvest by at least three times already in the past few days. (0800)

Farmers in the mountainous areas of Kazakhstan's Dzhambul Oblast completed their harvest operations today and started to send out grain on account for their third yearly plan. The yield was 23 quintals per hectare, which is 50 percent more than last year's. (1100)

In Novosibirsk Oblast, it has rained every day since 24 August, and energetic efforts are now being made to save the harvest, which is good but is lying rainsoaked in the fields. (1100)

Buckwheat, millet, and rice are being cultivated on 1 million hectares in Kazakhstan. Three-quarters of the groat yield has been harvested. There was a good harvest in Chimkent Oblast, where over 20,000 hectares were sown with rice, and the average yield from them is nearly 60 quintals per hectare. Kustanay and Tselinograd Oblasts have a good millet crop, and large quantities of buckwheat are being harvested in Uralsk Oblast. Groat crops are being produced in 10 of Kazakhstan's 19 oblasts. (1100)

In Tatariya, the potato and vegetable crop is good, but the fields are flooded with rainwater. Grain crops have still not been cleared from 300,000 hectares. (1100)

In many areas workers are having to lift potatoes by hand because vehicles cannot be used in the sodden fields. Hundreds of private cars can be seen on the edges of fields in Chelyabinsk Oblast. The detachments of factory workers have an interest in getting the harvest into the town stores quickly, because each one can take a specific proportion of the yield home. This stimulus has been used on many potato farms, especially in the Non-Chernozem Zone, where the situation is particularly worrying. In Novgorod Oblast, the harvesters are given every tenth sack, and in Moscow Oblast every sixth. As a result, in spite of the rain and mud, the rates of harvesting are higher on some farms than on the sunniest days. (1800)

Tula Oblast sold over 700,000 tonnes of grain to the state. The plan has been overfulfilled by 50 percent.

Military

Navy Main Staff's Navoytsev Interviewed

LD261716 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1600 GMT 22-24 Sep 87

[Report on "exclusive" interview with Admiral Petr Navoytsev, first deputy chief of the USSR Navy Main Staff, by Moscow Radio special correspondent Oleg Okulovskiy; date and place of interview not given; broadcast in three installments—read by announcer; Navoytsev's remarks recorded in Russian fading into Finnish translation]

[Text] [Announcer] We ask Admiral Navoytsev the first question. The United States has recently considerably extended the presence of its Navy in the north. Western propaganda claims that it is thus counteracting the intensified activity of the Soviet Navy in Murmansk and the Baltic Sea. How do you evaluate this, and how would you comment on these claims?

[Navoytsev] The claims of Western propaganda to the effect that it is only counteracting are absolutely groundless. In the matter of the increased naval presence the U.S. Navy's nuclear ships have indeed intensified in the last few years their patrolling in the North Atlantic, the Norwegian Sea, and the Barents Sea. The nuclear weapons in question are meant to be used against the Soviet Union. In the exercises arranged in these areas the biggest ships of the U.S. Navy take part. For example, in the "Northern Wedding" exercises in the Lofoten Islands in 1986 the aircraft carrier *Nimitz*, the battleship *Iowa* with Tomahawk missiles, and 150 other ships of other classes took part.

Quite recently approximately 150 ships including the aircraft carrier *Forrestal*, and 250 combat aircraft and helicopters took part in NATO's naval "Ocean Safari-87" exercise. In accordance with an agreement between the United States and Norway the number of exercises on the coast of northern Norway with the U.S. Navy's participation and including a landing by a Marine brigade should be almost doubled. The plans also include an increase in the number of visits by U.S. warships to Norwegian military bases and harbors.

There are eight airports ready in northern Norway at which U.S. tactical Air Force and Marine forward-based units can be deployed. Depots are being constructed in the center of the country for U.S. technology and equipment. Four to six U.S. Navy and Air Force squadrons exercise every year in northern Norway. U.S. spying planes carry out regular flights over the Norwegian Sea and Barents Sea. U.S.-built E3A AWACS planes, which are built for reaching a goal and for early warning, are being deployed at the Norwegian Orland air base.

The United States has also intensified its military activity on Greenland. This island, which belongs to Denmark, is being made an important fortress. It has been planned to be a staging post for aircraft and the Navy, for arranging electronic surveillance, for maintaining contact, and for resolving the strategic tasks of the U.S. Army.

In a military sense the United States has not left unattended the polar areas either. U.S. nuclear submarines regularly patrol the Arctic Sea under the ice. Last year alone they surfaced three times at the North Pole.

The U.S. military has also been acitve recently in the Baltic Sea. For the first time since World War II the United States concentrated in October 1985 in the NATO naval "Baltops-85" exercise a special force that included such big ships as the *Iowa* and the missile cruiser *Ticonderoga*.

Facts show that the Pentagon is consistently implementing the Reagan doctrine of direct confrontation, which aims to secure complete military superiority for the

United States and the restoration of its leading position in the world. A new U.S. naval strategy is being based on this. The aim of this strategy is to achieve superiority in all sea areas in peacetime. This strategy means a huge increase in the U.S. Navy, improving its combat capabilities by increasing quantity and quality of attack equipment. In addition, according to front sea-line theory, strong striking forces will be placed on the open seas bordering the regions of the Soviet Union. If earlier the United States considered its task to prevent the Soviet Union from reaching the North Atlantic, so now, according to Vice Admiral Mustin, U.S. Navy Staff deputy chief, the Navy's whole strategy today is aimed at getting its own forces to the front lines so that, when the need arises, the fight can be carried out in enemy areas, that is, in the areas of the Warsaw Pact countries.

This makes it quite clear that the intensified presence of the U.S. Navy on the northern seas has nothing to do with the mythical increase in the Soviet Navy, but that it is caused by the aggressive policy of the current U.S. leadership. The policy is based on specific military doctrine.

In our opinion it is utterly senseless to explain the presence of the U.S. Navy and the arrival of its ships thousands of miles from the U.S. coast in the Barents Sea and the Baltic with the excuse that there are Soviet warships here, on our own shores. On top of that, such explanations by no means accord with the U.S. Administration statements to the effect that it is aiming for peace and detente. Just imagine what sort of a commotion would take place if the Soviet Navy were to embark on the same sort of activities in the region of Boston or in Mexico, as the United States has done. But the Soviet moderation based on a defensive military doctrine causes no hullabaloo. So all kinds of untruths and theories are fabricated to defend the policy of expansion.

[Announcer] We asked the admiral how tension can be eased in the North Atlantic and in the northern sea areas in general, and what are his predictions for the development of the military-political situation in this area of the world.

[Navoytsev] Tension in the North Atlantic is caused primarily by the deployment and activities of the navies of the United States and some other NATO countries. Recently these activities have further intensified. The removal of this source of tension would undoubtedly ease the military-political climate in Northern Europe. A contribution to the creation of a calmer situation in the northern areas would, of course, be made also by a more active participation of the littoral states in measures to ease international tension.

The creation of a world free from violence and nuclear weapons would be helped if a new kind of political thinking were accepted as a starting-point. This again requires that both politicians and soldiers recognize the realities and the equality of the interests of the parties and refrain from use of force in dealing with international affairs.

The Soviet Union has often proposed to the world specific measures to strengthen mutual confidence and security in the sphere of military activities on land, at sea, and in the air. Moscow is still seeking possibilities of easing tension in Northern Europe and contiguous areas. It is difficult to predict development in this area, because the U.S. policy is unpredictable. But we are optimistic and believe in success and in an improvement of the situation, all the more because a new kind of political thinking is gaining a stronger hold in the West, too.

FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher spoke at the Free Democratic Party conference about the new kind of responsibility in our era in which no policy should jeopardize the survival of mankind. The possibility of destruction in the world of nuclear weapons leaves us no other alternative; we must make a decision against confrontation and for cooperation. We can only agree with such assessments.

In the policy of the North European countries the preservation and development of everything positive is of great importance, in other words, it is in complete contrast to NATO's ideas. By this I mean primarily the Finnish policy, outlined in the 1948 Treaty, Sweden's neutrality, Norway's and Denmark's policy of banning nuclear weapons and bases, and Iceland's nuclear-free status. The relaxation of tension and the strengthening of cooperation between states would also be promoted by all states closely observing the obligations they have accepted through international treaties, for instance, the Paris agreement on Svalbard, signed in 1929.

Various problems concerning the Law of the Sea are still awaiting solutions, including the demarcation of the continental shelf in the Barents Sea and the Baltic. It is necessary also to seek possible areas for bilateral and regional cooperation. In this sense a positive role could be played by the plan for the conclusion of agreements concerning the Law of the Sea for the prevention of conflicts. This idea was expressed in summer 1986 by former Norwegian Foreign Minister Knut Frydenlund.

Unfortunately the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union and some Nordic countries have encountered persistent opposition by the Pentagon. As one example we could mention in this connection the ideas expressed by Richard Perle, former U.S. assistant secretary for defense, about a Soviet nuclear threat and the senselessness of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. Thus we cannot yet say that the United States and NATO are really striving to strengthen security in Northern Europe. The facts indicate quite the reverse.

A new kind of situation also demands a new kind of attitude toward the solutions concerning the security of states. In the present conditions security depends by no means on an increase in nuclear weapons but on the joint action of states for the creation of a world free from nuclear weapons and violence. This view has not yet satisfied the U.S. Administration, whose activities create military threats and increase dangerous tension in the

world. Prejudices based on national selfishness should yield to new political thinking, for unilateral political security will never again be possible. Security can now be only common, bilateral and worldwide.

[Announcer] In Swedish territorial waters the hunt for foreign submarines has been going on for years. We ask Admiral Navoytsev to give an appraisal of this endless underwater hunt.

[Navoytsev] British Vice Admiral [name indistinct] earlier called the whole problem periscopitis. In Sweden submarines generally appear in unfathomable and impassable areas where, even in theory, they cannot enter. This is known to anyone who has the slightest understanding of matters concerning the movement of submarines. I would like to say that the so-called campaign concerning submarines observed in Swedish territorial waters would have no value, if the fight against the underwater flying saucers did not have an obvious anti-Soviet spirit and if the Swedish Government had not linked the investigation of the problem concerning the Swedish Navy's anti-submarine defenses and the expertise of its Navy with international relations.

Certain results have already been achieved through such a propaganda campaign in Sweden. First, the Swedish Government is prepared, with greater readiness than ever, to increase military allocations. Second, public opinion doubts the ability of the Social Democratic Party to protect the country's defense capability. Third, the idea to the effect that Sweden's defenses must be linked to NATO is constantly being forced on public opinion.

[Announcer] How can the Soviet side respond to the fact that it is being accused of submarine violations of Swedish territorial waters? To this Admiral Petr Navoytsev replies:

[Navoytsev] The Soviet Government and all the Armed Forces leadership are unquestionably interested in discovering the truth. We have declared with full responsibility that there are no Soviet submarines in Swedish territorial waters, nor can there be any, with the exception of the one case when in the fall of 1981 submarine No 137 developed faults in its navigation equipment and went aground. This incident was explained in detail in an interview last February by Soviet Navy Commander in Chief Vladimir Chernavin. At the same time it was firmly declared that there are no Soviet submarines in Norwegian or Swedish territorial waters.

The Soviet side has often turned to the Swedish authorities and called for an investigation of the allegations according to which virtually every day Soviet submarines appear in Swedish territorial waters. This question should be investigated all the more so because around the report of the special committee of the Swedish Riksdag on antisubmarine defenses a campaign has emerged that may seriously damage relations between the two countries. The problem could be solved either by giving the Soviet side an opportunity to examine in detail the reports of the committee, or by appointing a joint Soviet-Swedish commission of qualified experts that could thoroughly examine the matter and draw the corresponding and true conclusions.

[Announcer] What has been the Swedish side's attitude toward such a possibility of resolving the problem?

[Navoytsev] It avoided approving the Soviet proposal. The question of appointing a joint commission met with silence. The results of the investigations by the Swedish Riksdag committee were never given to us to examine. We received only a short report of the investigation material in the form of some kind of memorandum and one videotape of submarine tracks on the seabed. It was also announced directly that no information other than that in the memorandum would be made available to the Soviet Side.

Of course, because of the disjointed nature of the information we were unable to obtain a full picture of what really occurred in the Swedish fjords. Nevertheless, a competent Soviet committee that included scientists and experts on military technology examined and carefully analyzed the memorandum and the videotape and noted that neither the memorandum nor the videotape confirms the results of investigations given by the Swedish Riksdag committee. Soviet experts directed their attention to the fact that the videotapes of the tracks left by a submarine on the seabed had no mention of the date or place of the filming of the tape. According to the committee it was impossible to define exactly the size or the length of the tracks. When the Soviet experts examined the tracks on the seabed, they noted that these could have nothing in common with tracks of submarines, not even of minisubmarines. They may have been made by equipment often carried by fishing, cable, research and other special vessels, including Swedish ships. We have received no information, either, about optical or acoustic observations or radio signals, which are said to have been available to the parliamentary committee. There is not enough information about them in the memorandum so that we could examine and assess them.

So, in the opinion of Soviet scientists and experts it is impossible to prove on the basis of the memorandum or of the videotape that there have been Soviet submarines in Swedish territorial waters. There is no proof of it, nor can there be. The so-called undeniable facts had been designed from the outset only for laymen's information. We are surprised, by the way, that representatives of the Navy have taken a direct part in fabricating them.

I would still like to stress in particular that the solution of the submarine problem is in the hands of the Swedes. But for the sake of discovering the truth we are still ready to cooperate with Sweden.